School of Theology at Claremont
1001 1336569

WESTCOTT'S FEAR

By a Disciple

The Library

SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY
AT CLAREMONT

WEST FOOTHILL AT COLLEGE AVENUE
CLAREMONT, CALIFORNIA

Bernard Nigan

Leland N Carlson

WESTCOTT'S FEAR

WESTCOTT'S FEAR

BY A DISCIPLE

CAMBRIDGE
W. HEFFER & SONS LTD
1930

Theology Library
SCHOOL OF THEOLOGY
AT CLAREMONT
California

PRINTED IN ENGLAND.

Preface

LED, or rather compelled, by a remarkable series of events, the author was brought to face the question of Reservation and to study it. His consequent searching back along the course of the increasing demand, lately made so vehemently for its authorisation by the Church, has led him to the discovery that the uprise of the demand was coincident with the stir caused by Bishop Westcott when, kindled to enthusiasm by the account which Justin Martyr, describing a Celebration of Holy Communion in the early period of the Church, presents of ministration to the absentees, he responded to request and drew up an adaptation of Justin's method for sick absentees of to-day. It is evident to the writer, and the writer believes it will be evident to the reader of this book, that it was this permission given by Westcott, who possessed a quite unique influence in his day, which encouraged the demand for Reservation, hitherto well-nigh non-existent, to arise with strength and gave it an extension and toleration which could not have been its fortune otherwise. The tragedy is that Westcott was entirely against Reservation. There was "no question," he said, on which he "felt more strongly."

Prompted by this discovery, the writer, a disciple of Westcott and in close touch with those who brought Justin's use and request for its adoption before him, here analyses Westcott's enthusiasm.

The writer then describes the aberration of mind and practice of the Church in this regard from earliest times, of which every Church historian is aware, but which he believes is far too little known.

He notices then the protest Westcott made when he discovered that his action had been misunderstood and how he was vindicated by the authorities.

A4088

Next he considers the position of Luther with regard to the Presence in the Eucharist, and presents the general character of the English Reformation in the admirably objective description by Albert Hauck, and after that sets in detail before the reader the treatment of the Canon of the Holy Communion by the Church of England in 1549 and 1552.

The remarkable announcement of Archbishop Frederick Temple in 1898 with regard to the Bennett judgment is next stated, and after that the Bennett judgment itself is brought forward, and the relation to it of the Archbishop's announcement made clear. Justin's Use is then more deeply inspected and its real meaning unfolded.

Westcott's Fear, which gives the title to this book, the fear which underlay the caution and rarity (apparently only in two instances) with which he gave the above-mentioned permission, is then presented as stated by him in two noteworthy letters, and the closing chapters of the book are devoted to an analysis of his Fear.

Westcott was undoubtedly the Apostle, as Browning was the Poet, of the Incarnation for the last third of the nineteenth century, and he lived for some six months into the twentieth. That his Presentation of that Mystery is of value for men of to-day the writer is convinced. It was the opinion of an earnest student writing at the time of his death, who was for many years in correspondence with him, and whose estimate of his mind is in the course of this treatise incidentally given,[1] that "the prophetic element in his thought might well become clear in the days to come."

So to the writer it seemed good, from a general point of view, as well as to show what Westcott's Fear regarded as threatened, that, with the analysis of that Fear, there should be presented extracts from Westcott's writings that should bring before the readers of this humble treatise the teaching of Westcott on the central fact of our Faith.

[1] p. 123.

Contents

		PAGE
PREFACE		v
I.	THE SURGE OF THE SPIRIT	1
II.	THE ENTHUSIASM THAT IS OUR THEME	3
III.	AN ANALYSIS OF THE CHARM OF JUSTIN'S NARRATIVE	8
IV.	THE ATTRACTIVENESS OF THE TRANSACTION	13
V.	WHAT HAPPENED IN JUSTIN'S CENTURY AND AFTERWARDS	24
VI.	THE FINAL CAPTURE	34
VII.	WESTCOTT MISUNDERSTOOD	45
VIII.	WESTCOTT'S VICTORY	48
IX.	WHERE LUTHER HALTED	57
X.	THE POSITION OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND	66
XI.	THE TWO EDITIONS OF THE PRAYER-BOOK	75
XII.	THE EXPLOSIVE ALREADY LAID	83
XIII.	THE BENNETT JUDGMENT	91
XIV.	A DEEPER LOOK INTO JUSTIN	96
XV.	WESTCOTT'S FEAR	110
XVI.	WHAT IS TO BE MAINTAINED	118
XVII.	FURTHER STUDY	128
XVIII.	THE PRIORITY OF THE INCARNATION	138
XIX.	THE PERFECT LIFE AND THE SACRAMENTS	144

Chapter I.

THE SURGE OF THE SPIRIT

We will begin our study of Westcott's Fear by considering that enthusiasm of his, with which his Fear was connected. But of course we must first introduce Westcott himself. Let our first chapter accordingly concern itself briefly with the enthusiasm that Westcott himself created.

In Hindu sacred story it is related that to a certain ascetic, a king who had, after having established his son in his kingdom, and having reached the state of indifference toward the world, withdrawn into the forest, there came, as the ascetic stood looking up at the sun, keeping his arms erect and performing extreme austerity, "the honourable knower of the world-soul," Sākāyanya, seeming to the ascetic as he looked upon him "like a smokeless fire, burning as it were with glow."[1] Such indeed for numerous people was the impression given by the "knower of the soul" brought before the reader in these pages.

No doubt there were those on whom Westcott had no effect, but they must have been few or members of the dull currents found at all grades of our humanity into which the light of the upper world finds it hard to penetrate. He is known to have been considered rude, but that occasion was when the unhappy incumbent on whom the Bishop of Durham's wrath fell had not correctly filled in his list of confirmation candidates. Also it was said on one occasion to the writer that, considering what Westcott taught and did during the eleven years of his episcopate, the diocese would have been ruined, had he been bishop eleven years longer: but that was said by one for whom socialism[2] meant

[1] Maitri Upanishad 1.1.

[2] Westcott was, as the *Encyclopædia Britannica*[14] points out, "practically the founder of the Christian Social Union."

the foundering of all orderly society. On the other hand, who that has felt the uplift that that tenuous figure gave to the soul can adequately describe it? A leader in the co-operative movement told the writer how at a certain critical discussion at which he and others were holding consultation with the bishop, Westcott listened awhile, attentively wrapped in thought, until at a certain point in the argument the blue eyes shone out with startling effect, and the mediator clinched the business with a firm and convincing conclusion. It is well-known how people would take a long journey just to see the light that enlightened his sensitive features as he preached from the pulpit. On one occasion the writer, at a certain great conference in London of the Church, when a sort of dullness and suspense had come over the audience and a movement had consequently taken place among those on the platform to get Westcott who was present with them to speak, witnessed the immediate change when, having been persuaded to come forward, he entered upon his theme. At once one felt the surge of the spirit.

Chapter II.

THE ENTHUSIASM THAT IS OUR THEME

JUSTIN AND HIS ACCOUNT OF THE HOLY COMMUNION.
BAPTISM IN JUSTIN'S DAY.
THE PRAYERS PRELIMINARY TO COMMUNION.
THE CELEBRATION.

So much for the enthusiasm Westcott himself created in those who saw him. What was the enthusiasm which he himself felt, which is our theme?

Westcott had many enthusiasms. In fact his most remarkable characteristic was the range of his sympathy, or rather of his studious devotion. There seemed to be nothing, be it in heaven above or on earth beneath, a question of philosophy, or a matter of moment in everyday civic life, but at once and intensely when it was brought before him he took it to his heart and thought. It was a principle of his that such should be the mind of the theologian. Nothing should be alien. The world, for the Christian, was the Father's House.

Over what then was the enthusiasm we are now to consider? It was over a simple Christian Service of long ago, the naively-told Holy Communion described by Justin Martyr as observed at Rome in the middle of the second century.

JUSTIN AND HIS ACCOUNT OF THE HOLY COMMUNION

Truly it is an idyllic picture, become familiar at all events by report to people who are concerned with the church-thought to-day, just, the writer believes, because of this appreciation of it by Westcott at the critical time which this essay brings forward, a picture that well bears being looked at again and again. Not only does the manner so

naive of the writer attract, but also his character and manner of life. A far-travelled philosopher he, who had searched for truth, and had accordingly learned to love and reverence, and never ceased to love and reverence, the Greek philosophers of antiquity; who at last as he was meditating on a lonely spot hear the sea at Ephesus found truth of an old man who by chance came upon him there and discoursed to him on the Jewish prophets who foretold the Christ, not reasoners (Justin tells us) who deduce truth by argument, but, rising above that, simply bearing witness to what they were made to see by the Spirit of God; who after his conversion to Christ maintained his position and function of philosopher, declaring that he "found Christianity to be the only philosophy that was sure and suited to man's wants," who accordingly bore to Rome, the all-controlling centre of the world of his day, for announcement there the glorious news he had come to accept; who, the Christians in the city, of whose company he had become, being endangered by evil rumours, took upon himself to write a long treatise now in two parts, to the emperor, defending them from charges made against them (in that treatise this description of the Holy Communion), who was eventually brought before authority by his jealous non-Christian brother-philosophers, and thus finally met the penalty of his courage, becoming a martyr unto death for the testimony of Jesus. And not only does the personality of the narrator attract, but also the romantic setting of his theme. We find ourselves in the great imperial city of the classical world on which modern civilisation is built. We are not in the busy forum or the pillared temples, the imperial palace, or the houses of the great, but in some hidden and poor quarter, and there is "fear on every side," for the faith and practice of these people is suspect.

We have two accounts[1] of the mode of communion, almost verbally the same. In the first account communion is pictured taking place after a baptism; in the second as the regular Sunday service.

[1] Justin, Apol. i., 61, 65–67.

Baptism in Justin's Day

So we come to be told, as a prelude to the first account of the Holy Communion, what Christian Baptism meant in Justin's day. It was no casually acknowledged act. The apologist told the emperor this about it[1]: "I will explain to you how we dedicated ourselves to God when we were made new through Christ, lest by passing it over I should seem in any way unfair in my explanation."

"Those who are persuaded and believe that what we teach and declare to be true is true, and who promise that they can live accordingly" we accept as candidates. These then are "taught to pray and to ask of God with fasting for forgiveness of their former sins, and we ourselves pray and fast together with them. Then they are brought by us to a place where there is water and there are they born again. . . . For in the name of God the Father and Lord of the universe and of our Saviour Jesus Christ and the Holy Spirit do they receive the washing in water. For Christ said, Except ye be born again, ye shall not enter into the Kingdom of heaven. . . . And this washing is called Enlightenment, because those who learn these things have their understanding enlightened."

The Prayers Preliminary to Communion

He then proceeds to say: "Having thus washed him who is persuaded and has given his assent we bring him to where the brethren as they are called are gathered together to make earnest prayers in common for ourselves and for the newly enlightened one and for all others everywhere. Our prayer is that we, having learned the things that are true and having become good citizens [of the heavenly city][2] and guardians of the things commanded,[3] may be found worthy,

[1] The basis of the translation is the translation given by H. M. Gwatkin in his *Selections* [with accompanying translations] *from Early Christian Writers.*

[2] agathoi politeutai, "right livers" [Gwatkin].

[3] phulakes tōn entetalmenōn, "keepers of the commandments" [Gwatkin].

and so may be saved with the eternal salvation. When our prayers are ended we salute one another with a kiss."

These preliminary prayers are again described as a preface to the second account, and in the following manner: "On the so-called day of the Sun there is a meeting of all of us who live in cities or the country and the memoirs of the Apostles or the writings of the Prophets are read, as long as time allows. When the reader has ceased, the president gives by word of mouth his admonition and his exhortation to us to follow these excellent things. Afterwards we all rise together and offer prayers."

The Celebration

After each of these descriptions of the preliminary prayers there follows the account of the celebration itself. Seeing they are almost word for word the same, we combine the two accounts.

"When we have ceased to pray, bread is brought to the president of the brethren and a cup of wine and water, and the president takes it and offers up praise and glory to the best of his power to the Father of the universe through the name of the Son and of the Holy Spirit, and gives thanks at length for our having received these favours from Him, and the whole people present express approval with Amen, that word in the Hebrew language meaning So be it. Then, after the president has thus given thanks and the people have so expressed approval, the deacons, as they are called by us, allow[1] to each of those present to partake of the bread and wine and water for which thanks were given and by means of the deacons sending is effected to those who are not present."[2]

[1] didoasin, give.

[2] A literal translation of the two descriptions, here combined, of the taking of the bread and wine is as follows:—

(*a*) Then, the president having given thanks (eucharistēsantos) and all the people having by saying Amen expressed their assent (epeuphēmēsantos), those called by us deacons give to each of those present to partake of the bread over which thanks have been given (eucharistēthentos) and of wine and water, and to those not present they carry away.

(*b*) We all rise at once and offer prayers; and, as I said, when we have ceased to pray bread is brought and wine and water and the president

The Giving of Alms

So far—the two accounts together. To the second account there is added this account of the giving of alms, the "fellowship" (*koinōnia*) of the Acts of the Apostles: "Of those that are well to do and willing everyone gives what he will according to his own purpose and the collection is deposited with the president, and he it is that succours orphans and widows and those that are in want through sickness or any other cause and those that are in bonds and the strangers that are sojourning, and in short he has the care of all that are in need."

The Bishop and his Company

It was this scene then, depicted by Justin, that aroused Westcott's enthusiasm. It must have been a scene familiar to him from the beginning of his study of Church history. But at this moment it had been brought before him by the young men who had come to him as postulants for ordination and by other young men recently ordained. It had caught their imagination. So did the bishop and his entourage increase each other's enthusiasm.

likewise offers up prayers and thanksgivings (eucharistias) to the best of his power and the people express their assent (epeuphēmei). Then follows the distribution (diadosis) and the partaking of the things thanked for (tōn eucharistēthentōn) takes place (ginetai), for each one and to those not present it is sent [or "there is sending" (pempetai, with no pronoun)] by means of the deacons.

Chapter III.

AN ANALYSIS OF THE CHARM OF JUSTIN'S NARRATIVE

Its charm as Literature.
Its charm as composed so early in the Church's History.
Its charm as Greek.
Greek and therefore Non-Roman.
Simply as Greek.
Westcott's World-Book.

It would be interesting to analyse the charm Justin's narrative had for the Bishop and his company.

Its Charm as Literature

First, we might notice the pleasure it would give simply as a piece of literature: a clear frank story without any rhetorical thrills.

Its Composition at so early a period of the Church's History

We might next mark its early composition. Here we have the story of an eye-witness writing in mid-second-century the very first account of the Celebration of the Eucharist after St. Paul's account in the First Epistle to the Corinthians and the very different account in the Didache. The morning of each day has its freshness and its hope: the first voyage, the earliest track of the explorer. Here then was a scene in the Church's morning—no other account handed down! There was to be felt the fresh breeze and the quickening of the rising sun.

Its Charm as Greek

But more! It was Greek.

Greek and therefore Non-Roman

Yet, if we are to be frank—and we are on the line in our narrative, let us hope, of honest writers, seeing we have Justin and Greek to write about—probably the first attraction of the Greek form of this narrative for these clerics was a negative attraction, namely, that it was not Roman. Here was a piece of writing by a Churchman in Rome and regarding Churchmen of Rome not expressed in the tongue of the Caesars or the Popes. Here in fact was a piece of the Church's universal Greek non-Roman beginning based upon the nucleus at Jerusalem.

Be it noted that the bishop who preceded the Father-in-God round whom were gathered the clerics of our story, Joseph Barber Lightfoot, who was Westcott's leading pupil at Cambridge,[1] and afterwards his boon companion collaborator and confidential referee and predecessor in the charge of the diocese, than whom he used often to say, as he carried forward the diocesan work so largely on the lines Lightfoot had laid down, he had none nearer in spirit, had kindled in the diocese and in the Church at large much enthusiasm with regard to this Greek beginning of the Church; interest in the early Roman Church by his edition of St. Clement; in the wider province by his editions of St. Ignatius and St. Polycarp, the latter contemporary we may notice with our Justin; all that backed up by his previous attractive and scholarly editions of certain Epistles of St. Paul. He had also made clear to the Diocese that the effective source of Christianity in the part of England where it was situated was not Roman, but Celtic, inasmuch as the first missionary, Paulinus, a Roman missionary,[2] had fled at hearing of the advance of Oswald, a Christian of the earlier tide of conversion of our far islands of the West, and Oswald, assuming the rule of Northumbria, had sent for a bishop to Iona, by whose monks he had been trained, and received thence Aidan the first of their long line of

[1] See *Life of Bishop Westcott*, by his son Arthur, Vol. I, p. 107, etc.
[2] Bright, *Early English Church History*, p. 55.

diocesans; and did not this Iona-current not only congratulate itself on being non-Roman, but claim to be a part of the Eastern Christianity the diocese had become through the same Lightfoot so enthusiastic over? Lightfoot had also reminded them that it was one who, although he had acquired his legal knowledge and had practised it in Italy, and was zealous for the customs that were Roman, was of the Orient, as his name Theodore of Tarus showed him to be, and reputed to be familiar with the customs and literature of the Greeks,[1] who became Archbishop of Canterbury, and set our island episcopate into the compact form, increasingly sub-divided as it is, which it still possesses to-day.

Simply as Greek

But of course the fact that the narrative was Greek was in itself an attraction to Westcott and to those round him. There was the general charm that Greek has over all, even the least of its votaries, with so many elements in it that one can name, and with something also indefinable that nowhere else can be found.

Into the exploration of that charm Westcott had eagerly entered. He had gone to its distant heights, surveying as a curious and interested observer the myths of Plato, and the dramas of Euripides, and had visited its nearer Christian developments in Origen and Dionysius the Areopagite, in the former of whom he saw the beginnings of Christian philosophy.[2]

And it is to be specially noted that for Westcott the passage of Greek into these nearer Christian areas was not a passage from an exalted condition to a debased. In the expansion of Greek beyond Greece that began with the conquests of Alexander the Great he envisaged an ennobling of Greek. He saw begin in Alexandria with the Seventy Translators the adaptation of the Greek language to "the more exact and complete expression of conceptions which the Hebrew documents of the Holy Land and Babylon

[1] Bright, *Early English Church History*, pp. 215, 224, 362.
[2] See B. F. Westcott, *Religious Thought in the West.*

could convey only in colossal outline,"[1] a process which found its consummation in the Greek Testament. He regarded "the whole Greek race" as thus having "with unconscious labours prepared instruments of precise analysis of exposition,[1] that should produce at last in their own tongue" what was for him the Book of all Books.

Westcott's World-Book

This induces us to bring before the reader the most characteristic and concise picture we can present of Westcott. We would have the reader linger before it. It is of Westcott as, during the twenty years of his Regius-Professorship at Cambridge, he was accustomed to stand at his lectern in the morning, his hair drawing to silver as the years went on, his whole person in agitation, his voice modulated and his face lighted by his theme, the Book he so loved before him, rolling out catenae of passages and minute exposition in the presence of an awe-struck youth. As H. E. Ryle, eventually Bishop of Winchester, puts it: "To attend Westcott's divinity lectures, even to watch him lecturing, was an experience which lifted and solemnised many a man to whom his references to Origen and Rupert of Deutz were almost ludicrously unintelligible." True, the marvel of Westcott was that he should so persevere in proclaiming what he must have known would be unintelligible there and then to at least most of his hearers; and the marvel that people should—not as we might say by compulsion the youth before us, who hoped eventually to appeal for admission to Holy Orders, and of whom when they made their appeal certificates of attendance at lectures of a Divinity Professor would be required, but without question voluntarily—crowd to patiently listen to him; but the expression was his, the impression was theirs, and some of them no doubt hoped that in due time they would understand him better.

And this Book that he so patiently and enthusiastically

[1] B. F. Westcott, *Gospel of Life*, p. 114.

and meticulously expounded—for no particle was missed—was a book in Greek and yet beyond Greek, the World-Book indeed, to be compared with none other, unique in itself, yet not for itself, for its uniqueness and its supremacy and power consisted in its containing the record, the words, the derivative doctrines and manners and polity of the One Perfect Life, actually manifested, in which all mankind should be saved, the Life indeed more than the Book, for that Life, not the Book, was the Gospel.

Chapter IV.

THE ATTRACTIVENESS OF THE TRANSACTION

The character of the transaction in the light of history.
Westcott and controversy.
Westcott's principle of guidance as to what is the proper doctrine and practice of the Church.
The social aspect.
The practical question.
Inclusiveness the attraction that held the company.
Why this endeavour to include all inspired Westcott.
Westcott's caution.
Desire for reservation for the sick had for some time been bestirring in the Church.

The Character of the Transaction in the Light of History

But, as we try to realise the attraction the narrative of Justin had for our company, we may not stop at its literary charm, great though that was. The transaction itself attracted. Here was a much-travelled philosopher who had become an enthusiastic Christian telling the world-power of that early day what was the doctrine and practice of the Holy Communion, and through the minds of our company we have to imagine passing the perennial and arresting interest of the Holy Ordinance, and not only of the ordinance in itself, but of how differently it had been understood as the course of history went on, what passion, what antipathy it had awakened, how variously it had been presented, how many volumes of description and discussion had been written about it, how many martyrs for it and martyrs against there had been. Was there any ordinance on earth into which and round which so many controversies had been woven, to which so many souls had been attracted

on their earthly voyage, like birds of passage to a beacon in mid-ocean, rejoicing in its comfort on their weary transit, and how many too, suddenly held up, had been confused by its glare and struck down, an ordinance regarding which we might use the words which Jesus in the Gospel is declared to have used regarding Himself: "He that falleth on this stone shall be broken to pieces; but on whomsoever it shall fall, it will scatter him as dust"? And yet in Justin with what simplicity, with what confidence, with how little notion of these perils was that holy ordinance carried through!

Westcott and Controversy

Not that for a moment we are to imagine the Bishop and his company approving this presentation of early simplicity as an opportune spring-board for controversy.

Simplicity indeed Westcott loved. It was after all the very simplicity of his thought that made him so difficult to understand. He got beneath phrases. All show and parade and multiplication was distasteful to him; be it in Church or in State. But he was content to accept things, so far as externals went, pretty much as they were, and, connoisseur of art as he was, he could and did appreciate glory and beauty.

But he disliked controversy. Bishop H. E. Ryle says truly of him, "he kept himself aloof from all party strife."[1] In that he was like his pupil and notable collaborator in New Testament textual collation, F. J. A. Hort. His former domestic chaplain[2] throughout his episcopate writes: "The reader of his charges will look in vain for more than a veiled reference to such things as 'burning questions' and what are called periodically 'crises' in the English Church. Of these he said (in 1898): 'No, I don't think I could speak on "present controversies" (i.e. ritual matters, etc.) even at a Diocesan Conference. It all seems to me so alien to the

[1] H. E. Ryle, art. "Westcott," *Encycl. Brit.*[11]

[2] C. H. Boutflower, Bishop of Southampton.

great things of our Faith.' "[1] Bishop H. E. Ryle, commissioned to give a brief description of the Bishop's life and manner of thought, takes this passage from one of Westcott's published works as a good description of Westcott himself: "The student of Christian doctrine, because he strives after exactness of phrase, because he is conscious of the inadequacy of any one human formula to exhaust the Truth, will be filled with sympathy for every genuine endeavour towards the embodiment of right opinion. Partial views attract and exist in virtue of the fragment of truth—be it great or small—which they include; and it is the work of the theologian to seize this no less than to detect the first spring of error. It is easier and, in one sense, it is more impressive to make a peremptory and exclusive statement and to refuse to allow any place beside it to divergent expositions; but this show of clearness and power is dearly purchased at the cost of the ennobling conviction that the whole truth is far greater than our individual minds. He who believes that every judgment on the highest matters different from his own is simply a heresy must have a mean idea of the Faith, and, while the qualifications, the reserve, the lingering sympathies of the real student make him in many cases a poor controversialist, it may be said that a mere controversialist cannot be a real theologian."[2]

Not that Westcott did not clearly see and deplore in his heart much that to him seemed aberrations from the Faith as he understood it. His former domestic chaplain, in the excellent and tabulated collection he published, just quoted from, of *bon mots* of the bishop in private conversation, thus writes of the bishop's mind when, during the Transvaal war of 1899, he returned home from a brief stay at Lambeth where he had met certain other bishops and ritual excesses had come up into discussion: "The bishop has just returned from

[1] In "Bishop Westcott as Diocesan" in the Bishop's *Life* by his son Arthur, Vol. II, p. 369.

[2] Passage in lecture on "The Method and Spirit of Studying Christian Doctrine" in *Lessons from Work*, p. 84.

Lambeth depressed. He says he is no fighter; but he is more convinced than ever that, as in this Transvaal war, the points specially in evidence have been only symptomatic; that there is beneath a deep cleavage with those who will be satisfied with nothing but the readmission of medievalism. And war will be inevitable."[1]

Westcott's Principle of Guidance as to what is the Proper Doctrine and Practice of the Church

And here we have in a paragraph from his book, *The Gospel of Life*, Westcott's principle of judgment on such questions: "No one, I imagine, would seriously hold that the doctrines of contemporary Romanism have been secretly taught from the days of the Apostles in unbroken succession; or that the Gospel was corrupted from the close of the Apostolic age till the sixteenth century; or that necessary new truth was 'developed' as a permanent, fixed, endowment of Christendom under infallible guidance. We see that a divine life is manifested more or less perfectly from age to age through a divine society; but the manifestation is not the life. As the circumstances of men and nations change, materially, intellectually, morally, the life will find a fresh and corresponding expression."[2]

So it was not that they might fight for a Protestant simplicity that the Bishop and his company were drawn to this plain unadorned scene that Justin describes.

[1] "Some Sayings of Bishop Westcott," by C. H. Boutflower, *Contemporary Review*, December, 1903, p. 797.

"The bishop describes this incident in a letter from Lambeth to his wife:

'Lollards' Tower, 15 Nov., 1899.

. . . Being very busy I was hardly disturbed by an opening of the door and looking up I saw Mr. Hensley and then Mrs. Hensley. They stayed some little time and were most kind in their inquiries and seemed to be well. I dined with the rest of our party and then the Bishops of Winchester and Salisbury came into my room, and we had a long talk of all things and more. Certainly there is very much to cause alarm. I feel sure that (as in South Africa) a war is inevitable. The causes alleged may be trivial, but behind there is the conflict of Roman and Anglican principles which are absolutely irreconcilable, and I cannot fight. Alas! fighters are needed.' "

From *Life of Brooke Foss Westcott*, by his son Arthur, Vol. II, p. 309.

[2] *The Gospel of Life*, p. 280.

The Social Aspect

As a matter of fact, what attracted the Bishop and his company was the social aspect of Justin's use. What a beautiful and comprehensive spiritual hospitality that was that would not allow anyone to be left outside the partaking! The spiritual feast was for all. To all must the viands thereof be taken. None of those who should and would have been present should be suffered to remain an outsider. If he could not come, the food of the fellowship must be brought to him. The all-inclusiveness was attractive.

The Practical Question

And above all—we are not to think of our admirers of Justin as mere dilletanti—there was a practical motive behind all this; and it is a question whether it was not just this that awakened someone of the company to recollect this early Church incident and draw to it the Bishop's attention. The main motive was the evident call to include all the communicants of a parish when a celebration took place. For as a rule some one was left out when the great common gathering was held round the Lord's Table. There might be, in fact there usually was, one or more than one regular absentee, some bedridden saint who was thus shut off entirely from the general gathering; or it might be some one suffering from temporary illness or from accident. For the permanent invalid the permanent shutting-off was a special misfortune. The Order for the Communion of the Sick was no substitute for the Order of the General Communion. In fact it emphasised the apartness of those who received ministration under it. The difficulty was solved by Justin. All absentees were brought in by his method within the one common circle of actual receivers. The barriers of time and place were by his use overcome. Might not this method then be adopted in an English parish of to-day? Why not ask the Bishop about it?

Inclusiveness the Attraction that held the Company

Now there are two matters of moment evidently here. The one is the Transport of the bread and wine, over which, as Justin puts it, "thanksgiving had been said." The other is the Inclusion of all the communicants.

Of these two components it was the Inclusion of all the communicants, the All-inclusiveness we might call it briefly, the fact that none were left out, but that the whole of the fellowship was brought in, that attracted our company. Of the other feature, the carrying of the elements, let more be said anon. For the moment, and for the Bishop and the majority at all events of those round him, that was in abeyance. The one splendid gain here in the minds of those now before us, if this method of Justin's were adopted, would be the Inclusion of all.

Why this endeavour to include all inspired Westcott

It is a bold step now we put before ourselves and the reader, when we put the question: What was it, as he contemplated this endeavour to include all the communicants of a parish most actually, time and space overcome, that made the endeavour so inspiring for Westcott? For it means that we ascend the heights.

Two portraits of Westcott we have placed before our reader. The first formed our opening. There we presented Westcott as another sage Sākāyanya as the ascetic king viewed him, "a smokeless fire, burning as it were with glow." The second was in our last chapter when in the morning light, rolling out his catenae of texts and expounding their meaning, the Divinity Lecturer stood before his youthful listeners, his World-book, out of which he drew these catenae, the Greek Testament, before him. But now we have to withdraw from the forest and also from the Regius Professor's properly official lecture-room. We have yet further and higher to go. We have to get nearer to

Westcott. There are those of mankind who live on the mountains. Of these Westcott was one.

This Westcott on the mountain, Bishop Ryle, whose encomium of the just mentioned Divinity lectures we quoted, brings before us, when, after having expatiated on the lectures which were of normal and statutory order, he tells us in a side remark, as it were in a whisper, in the same account he was commissioned to write of Westcott for the information of the public,[1] that Westcott gave certain other expositions "more private," so he puts it, "and esoteric." It is to Westcott delivering these that we must now hand up our reader.

It is evening. We ascend the stairs of the divinity school. We enter a dimly-lighted room. There is a long table-top on trestles, on which are paper and pens set at intervals, before them seated certain members of the university in their gowns ready to take notes. At the head of the table is a high desk, and before it stands Westcott. His theme is the Perfect Life. If the listeners in the morning in the crowded lecture-room below coming half by compulsion were awestruck, these few wholly voluntary attenders are uplifted. Screeds of texts and the balancing of passages have been left below. Here the results of the study are presented worked out so as to embody the wonderful meaning which the lecturer held they contained.

"The Perfect Life!" he told his disciples, "has been given to the World, the life which for us upon the earth presents the fulness of human powers, powers of action and thought and feeling, of command and sympathy and influence, the powers characteristic of man and of woman, shown naturally with absolute majesty and grace, the life in which all that had won enduring admiration in earlier times found a place, in which no one could not find now that which interpreted and hallowed his own personality, the life from which the lapse of time took nothing from its completeness and which offered no situation that it was not fitted to meet with calm sufficiency. In that life peculiarities of time and place

[1] Art. "Westcott" in *Encycl. Brit.*[11]

and class and work and temperament are lost. It embraces them all, summing them all in a manhood universal." Even with this much description he declared the portrait was not complete: "Yet beyond this comprehensive humanity," he insisted, "there lies in that life something not of man, a conscious sovereignty over men and nature answering to the voice of unfailing knowledge, a vision which sees the truth of things beneath the phenomena of time." "So does the Person of the Lord," he would go on to say, "satisfy the requirement of growth that belongs to the religious nature of man. Our sense of the perfections of Christ grows with our own moral advance. In this supreme humanity is included whatever belongs to the consummation of the individual and of the race. It is, I believe, true without exception in every realm of man's activity, true in action, true in literature, true in art, that the works which receive the most lasting homage of the soul are those which are the most Christian, and that it is in each the Christian element, the element which answers to the fact of the Incarnation, to the fellowship of God with man as an accomplished reality of the present order, which attracts and holds us." And if in that Life "all that is proper to the human ideal is included," he went on to insist, "so is for each individual his place in it. The individual virtues of courage and self-respect, self-devotion and service, are here raised to a new elevation and intensity by the awakening in those who receive the life a habitual sense of divine fellowship. Tenderness, compassion, meekness, humility are here revealed in their true majesty. There is no one who cannot find in it that which interprets and completes and hallow his own personality. And it is an ideal fulfilled. To every man it is given to be in him 'the power of God unto salvation.'"[1]

There, then, was the Perfect Life, the Complete Humanity, into which Westcott saw the body of Communicants brought, the more completely the better, and, if not completely, lacking, just in so far as the body was short of a

[1] *The Gospel of Life*, pp. 296–301 passim.

member, what was the true ideal God held for it as a whole and for each individual member thereof.

It was well, then, that the messengers should bring to all members the bread and the wine.

No wonder so actually inclusive a use as Justin here described was attractive.

Westcott's Caution

But along with this Including of All the Communicants as the feature of the transaction of Justin's that gave the transaction its main attraction for Westcott there was the second feature we have noted—its "other component" as we called it—namely, the Means by which the Inclusion was effected, that is to say the Transport or carrying and administering of the bread and the wine to those visited.

Here Westcott showed considerable caution. We shall presently be quoting his own words in a letter of his. Meanwhile let us give a familiar description of what he required. We may put it this way. While the service of Communion was being held in the parish church, after the elements had been consecrated and while the congregation were partaking, one of the clergy taking part in the service was almost unobserved to quietly withdraw from the sanctuary with such of the bread and wine as was deemed sufficient in his hands and without ostentation make his way to the house where the sick communicant lay. Of his coming the sick man was to be made in ample time aware and was, as the messenger approached, to be already engaged as fully as might be in the service, the prayer-book it might be in his hands, or his friends helping him as adequately as they could, the Canon or Rule of the service thus read by him or to him or at any rate in his mind. To him thus prepared and to all intent and in actual intelligence a worshipper with those then present in the sanctuary, the sacred elements were to be dispensed, and after that dispensation, the order of the Holy Communion, be it by the ministry of the bearer of the elements or by the sick man and his friends after he had gone, was to be followed in the

Prayer-book to its conclusion. Thus, except for the space with its houses or fields that lay between, the sick man was to be, no item of prayer and announcement as far as possible left out, one of the congregation.

We may well ask: Why this meticulous care?

Desire for Reservation for the sick had for some time been bestirring in the Church

Now, although it would appear that it was these discussions under Westcott with regard to Justin, and his evidently being attracted by the use described, and his allowing, however carefully and seldom, its adoption, that set the attention of the Church of that day upon Justin's bright picture and drew men beyond Durham to desire Justin's method adopted, such was the influence of Westcott as (the writer thinks it will be conceded) the most influential theologian in the Church of his day, yet already desire, no doubt never extinct, for reservation had been showing itself and the practice had at times been adopted.

Scudamore, writing some twenty years before these discussions at Durham in the second edition published in 1876 of his "Notitia Eucharistica," laments that the provision made for reservation for the sick in the first Prayerbook (1549) of the Reformers was suppressed in the subsequent edition (1552). He acknowledges that the suppression was entirely within the discretion of a national branch of the Church Catholic, but he begs to be allowed to "regret it as rash and inexpedient." "The provision," he goes on to say, "identified more fully the practice of our Church with ancient and even primitive usage and gave a solemn publicity to the Communion of the sick man which would make the Communion on his part a more marked confession of Christ before men and tend far more to the edification of his Christian neighbours. The practical disadvantage of the omission," he declares, "is also very considerable. In populous places, especially in times of pestilence, it is often extremely difficult to supply the wants of the sick and dying without it. There have been

cases of necessity even, in which the Clergy, rather than allow the sick to die uncommunicated, have ventured to recur to this provision of 1549." He quotes Mr. Perry, writing in a work published in 1863, as saying: "The writer knows that a member of the present English Episcopate (and one who would certainly not be said to hold very high views on the Eucharist) not infrequently in his ministrations when he was a parochial incumbent reserved the Sacrament at the public Celebration, for the use of the sick. Also, it is not a secret that during the cholera in Leeds some years ago the Bishop of Ripon, while saying that he could not authorise Reservation, did not feel himself justified in forbidding it in that emergency."[1]

And Canon Evan Daniel, in an edition he published in 1901 of his book on the Prayerbook, accordingly just after these discussions in Durham, and the Opinions upon their subject-matter delivered in 1900 by the Archbishops of Canterbury and York, which will in due course claim our attention, presents to us a general view of what was felt at the time, stating that "many Churchmen are in favour of reviving the practice of reservation for the sick," giving us as their reasons for revival the reasons above-stated by Scudamore and adding as another reason, that "the surroundings of the poor do not always allow of a seemly consecration in the sick room."[2]

[1] W. E. Scudamore, *Notitia Eucharistica*,[2] p. 1017.
[2] Evan Daniel, *The Prayerbook*,[20] p. 398.

Chapter V.

WHAT HAPPENED IN JUSTIN'S CENTURY AND AFTERWARDS

The development of the dealings with the Bread and Wine.
Westcott's view of Justin's use in this regard.
The general belief that the material elements used in the Sacrament retained their significance.
The Bread and Wine dispatched as a sign of orthodoxy.
The special quality induced by a special occasion.
The use to confer security.
The sacred Bread as a charm against danger.
As a means of healing.
As a convoy for the dead.
The sacred Bread defending itself.
Prohibition.

The Development of the Dealings with the Bread and Wine

Perhaps we may come to an answer to our question why Westcott was so minutely careful as to the carrying and administration of the bread and wine to the sick absentee when we review what must have been familiar to him, the changing phases of the conception of and dealings with these material elements which are recorded of Justin's own century and afterwards.

What we find is that these material means of the Sacrament came to be identified more and more with the holy and spiritual food which with their giving was given, so that they became to be more and more regarded as continuing to be outside the transaction what they had been within it. To express their exploit picturesquely, they took up a journey by themselves in which they assumed independent importance more and more so that at last they

received the homage that was due only to the very body and blood of the Lord.

Westcott's view of Justin's use in this regard

Westcott indeed held that any such extra-liturgical valuation of the bread and wine and the Sacrament was not discernible in Justin's use. In it he maintained the Eucharistic service was kept completely and contemporaneously together, so that whatever importance the material elements were credited with in a later day they were here still moving within the ceremony. Their independent career had not yet commenced.

The General Belief that the Material Elements used in the Service retained their significance

Yet, whatever may be said as to Justin, the fact seems to be that this independent value of the material elements of the Sacrament was, or came to be, very early a common belief of the Church. Thus we find the great Tertullian, notable Church-writer, living at the close of Justin's, the second, century and through the early years of the next, a reputable founder of a certain type of Western theology, although he veered into strange views in his later years, stating that it was a usual custom for people to carry away from the service portions of the consecrated bread for consumption at their leisure and, it would appear, before the commencement of ordinary meals.

In fact there evidently came to be little regard for the connexion between the elements used and the feast itself, even by the Church's leading personalities. Thus the said Tertullian writing at Carthage in 291 advised a man who had a scruple about taking the bread and wine in the actual Communion while he was observing a fast, to "take away," as that great Church father puts it, "the body of the Lord and reserve it until his fast should be over."[1] Basil, a teaching theologian of the East in the fourth century,

[1] Scudamore, art. "Reservation" in Smith and Cheetham's *Dictionary of Christian Antiquities.*

tells us that solitaries reserved the sacred elements for their use when a priest was not near. Holy Women, Mgr. Freeland informs us, had it in their settlements and administered it to themselves. This consumption of the reserved elements was frequent, St. Basil tells us, in times of persecution.

We must sympathise with these devout people, and yet which of us will not agree with Archbishop Maclagan's Opinion in his Court when these doings were brought before him that such customs "cannot be regarded as ministrations of the Holy Communion according to the purpose of our Lord or the teaching of St. Paul"?[1] a plain condemnation.

That this taking of the sacred elements apart from the service was not always prompted by a deeply spiritual devotion, however, we gain from the rebuke that the stern Church father, St. Jerome, of the later years of the fourth century and earlier of the fifth, gave to people who deemed themselves unfit to receive the sacred elements in church, but were not afraid to consume them for their good, as they thought, in their own homes.[2] Still more are we astonished when we read what that careful student Scudamore discovered, that not only did people in those days thus take what had been given at the Holy Communion away for their private consumption, but also that they passed on the sacred elements for consumption by others.

But indeed we have a proof of the recognition and approval by highest authority of the retention in the material elements of the virtue they were deemed to receive in the Sacrament in the Order of the Mass of the Pre-sanctified (that is the Mass of the previously consecrated elements), a rite which, Scudamore tells us, was founded early in the East, the Council of Laodicea, probably about 365, laying down a canon which implies it and which appears to "state and

[1] *Opinion*, May 1, 1900. See Chapter viii.

[2] Ep. 48 "ad Pammach," § 15, quoted by Scudamore, art. "Reservation," *Dictionary of Christian Antiquities*.

confirm an old custom rather than to found a new rite."[1] In this use, when, as on a Good Friday or at such other times the service with the consecration was not deemed fitting, previously consecrated elements which had been reserved in the sacristy were brought back again into the sanctuary and partaken of in a service without any consecration. We find the ceremony set forth with much detail in the Byzantine Liturgy of the ninth century in which the people as the elements enter make acclamation with the words "Behold the King of Glory cometh in."[2]

The Consecrated Bread and wine dispatched as a sign of Orthodoxy

Yet in all we have met with hitherto the Bread and Wine are distinctly portions retained from the transaction at the Feast and consumed as such, but what shall we say to their being dispatched from one circle of Communicants to another, not with the idea of co-communion, but as convenient tokens or tesserae that meant recognition of the orthodoxy of those to whom they were sent?

Irenaeus, the great bishop and theologian who came originally out of Asia Minor, Bishop of Lyons, and so the head of all the Christians in Gaul, writing at the close of the century at the middle of which Justin published his Apology, informs Victor, who was Bishop of Rome from 189 to 198, that the presbyters before him (Irenaeus) who did not observe a certain mode of calculating the occurrence of Easter, the quarto-deciman method, sent the Eucharist to those of other districts who did observe that mode, Irenaeus stating this to show that, notwithstanding the difference in calculating Easter Day, these presbyters were equally members of the Church of Christ.

Here then is the cream-coloured bread, like the dove, pure white as we picture it, that came to the ark of Noah over the retreating waters of judgment with the olive-branch

[1] Scudamore in art. "Presanctified, Mass or Liturgy of" in *Dict. Christian Antiquities*.

[2] F. E. Brightman, *Eastern Liturgies*, p. 348.

in its mouth (sign of a world restored and so of the favour of heaven) sent from one church to another, messenger of peace and of the better mankind now surely established in the body of Christ.

The Development of the Idea in Dispatch as a Token of Orthodoxy

To come to a later century: we are told in the *Liber Pontificalis* of Rome that the custom of sending the Fermentum—as the consecrated bread was called—to the churches in that city originated with Melchiades, 311, and that Sircius in 385 "ordained that no presbyter should celebrate masses through the whole week unless he received a certified (declaratum) consecrated (portion) from the bishop of the place appointed (for a station)."[1] From a letter ascribed to Innocent I, 402, but according to Scudamore apparently composed by a later and inferior writer, we learn that the Pope sent the leaven "per titulos" to the churches within the city, that the dispatch took place on Sundays, so that "the presbyters who on that day could not meet him (in worship) on account of the people committed to them, might not, above all on that day, feel themselves cut off from communion with him." We find in this letter the question put to the writer by another bishop whether the same sending might not be practised outside an episcopal city.[2] To this letter a gloss is appended, in which only certain special occasions for mass are mentioned in which we are told that "on Easter Eve no presbyter in the baptismal churches communicates anyone before there be sent to him of that very same holy thing which the Lord Pope hath offered."[3]

As we question the significance of the bread here we seem to see something more in it than its becoming by its dispatch

[1] Anast. Biblioth. "de Vitis Pont. Rom.," nn. 32, 39, pp. 12, 22, quoted by W. E. Scudamore, art. "Fermentum" in Smith's *Dict. Christian Antiquities*.

[2] Innoc. "Ep. ad Decent." in Cigheri, "V.PP. Theolog. Univ.," tom. iv, p. 178 id.

[3] Mabillon, "Itin. German Descript.," p. 65. Hamb. 1717, id.

a sign of the orthodoxy of those to whom it is sent. It looks as if the offering of it by the Pope, the fount of orthodoxy, had given it, the bread, the material element, a spiritual quality and a higher spiritual quality than a less authoritatively orthodox offerer could have bestowed.

The special quality induced in a special occasion

The impression that a special virtue was thus absorbed by the bread is confirmed by what we read concerning the sacred elements that had been used at some special Celebration. We find mention of a custom which in the opinion of Morinus[1] sprang up in Italy in the 8th century, according to which the Pope at the communion that followed the consecration of a bishop gave the remainder of the whole oblate to the bishop, that had received a portion of it at that communion, so that he might have that remainder for his communions of forty days. Fulbert, Bishop of Chartres, who was born in the 10th century, we find telling us of the extension of this observance for the benefit of presbyters, so that they received similarly for their subsequent use the consecrated element used when they were ordained. Fulbert believed the practice to be universal. Scudamore notes its observance for bishops at Concha in Spain, Saltzburg, Toulouse, Rouen, Rheims, and the Latin Church of Constantinople. Similarly we find until the 11th or 12th century or even later women on the day when they made solemn profession having the reserved sacrament with them for a retreat of eight days that they might partake daily of the heavenly food.[2] It is difficult to feel that it was not the belief of those who observed this practice that the grace of the moment was in some way inhering in or identical with the material. At all events it must occur to those who read these accounts that there was great danger of that.

The use to confer security

And what do we think of this? The use of the wine of

[1] "De Sacr. Ordin." P. III Exerc. viii, cii, § iv noted in Scudamore's Article Fermentum, D.C.B., referred to above.

[2] *Prayer Book Dictionary*, by Geo. Harford and Morley Stevenson.

the Eucharist to dip the pen into at the solemn moment of subscribing important documents such as the decrees of councils or that in which the condemnation of Pyrrhus was written by Pope Theodore,[1] or when at the dedicating of churches three portions of the host would be put into the altar and cealed with cement therein.[1]

Here the bread and wine have evidently become commodities charged with an influence that makes that of circumstance or place within which they have been brought more secure and more to be regarded with awe.

So we witness the material elements withdrawing further and further from the sacred feast. They have acquired an inner power of their own which is derived from the Feast, but no longer requires the Feast for environment.

The white dove with its token of peace has now, as did Noah's at its last sending out, left the ark, its house of rescue and nurture, on the abiding in which its very existence as a dove had depended, altogether.

The Sacred Bread as a Charm against Danger

So we need not be astonished when we further find the sacred bread come to be carried as a charm against danger. St. Ambrose, Bishop of Milan, 374-394, informs us that his own brother, Satyrus, when shipwrecked bound the "sacrament" in a scarf round his neck before taking to the water, having obtained "that divine sacrament of the faithful"—so Ambrose describes it—from some of his fellow passengers and was so saved from being drowned.[2] We read how in England, Birinus, Bishop of Dorchester (635) carried the "Eucharist" wrapped in his pall, and of priests who, as was then "the custom of many," we are told, "carried it as safeguard by the way."[3] Our Archbishop of Canterbury,

[1] "A Catholic Dictionary," quoted by Bishop Jayne in *Anglican Essays*, pp. 314–15.

[2] Ambrose, "de Obit. Fratris," iii. 19, alluded to in Scudamore's art. "Eulogiae," Smith and Cheetham's *Dict. Christ. Antiquities*.

[3] Scudamore, who gives references, art. "Reservation of the Eucharist," idem.

St. Thomas Becket (12 c.) carried the "sacrament" with him when he went to meet his wrathful sovereign, Henry II. St. Louis (13 c.) King of France, had it with him, by permission of the papal legate, when he went to the far side of the sea. We find one or two instances of priests in later times (for example, in the "Life" of Savonarola, 1452-1498) carrying it for their safety. Among Greek monks the custom was still maintained when Arcudius wrote his work *De concordia Ecclesiae Occid. et Orientalis in vii Sacramentorum Administratione* in the seventeenth century.[1]

The Sacred Bread a means of Healing

With this use in vogue of the bread of the sacrament as a means of protection we can understand the use of it as a means of healing. St. Gregory of Nazianzen (330–397) speaks of his sister Gorgonia as "treasuring up with her hand the antitypes of the precious Body and Blood"[2] and relates how she cured herself of an illness by applying a portion of the reserved sacramental bread to her body.[3] St. Augustine, Bishop of Hippo, tells us in the last year of his life, 430, that one Acatius whom he had known asserted that, having been born blind, he was restored to sight by his mother applying a poultice made out of the bread that had been used at the eucharist.[4]

The Sacred Bread a Convoy for the Dead

But if a means of protection and an instrument of healing the bread used in the Sacrament might be in this life, why not beyond the grave? Pathetic is the custom we find mentioned of placing before he was buried the blessed bread in the dead man's lips. Father Thurston, the Jesuit,

[1] These instances of St. Thomas à Becket, etc., are taken from the "Catholic Dictionary" by Bishop Jayne in Appendix to *Anglican Essays*.

[2] "Greg. Naz. Orat.," xi, p. 187, quoted by Scudamore in "Eulogiae," *Dict. Christ. Ant.*

[3] D. L. Murray, *Reservation*, p. 10.

[4] "Cont. Julian," iii. 162. Scudamore, *Notitia Eucharistica*, p. 905.

compares it in this use to the small coin placed in pre-Christian days into the mouth of the dead as a fare for Charon the ferryman of the river in the underground region, that he might take the deceased across in his boat to the Land of the Blest.[1]

The Sacred Bread Defending Itself

With what strange and far-reaching power then was the bread conceived to be endowed. No wonder that such a story should be told, as Cyprian, Bishop of Carthage, 248–258, has told us, regarding a woman, who was counted in the number of those who had lapsed from the Christian standard of confession of the faith in those days of sore persecution by the State, that, having "attempted to open with unworthy hands her casket in which the holy thing of the Lord (*domini sanctum*) was stored, she was deterred by fire rising out of it."[2]

Prohibition

So we find the Church bestirring herself. The sending of the sacred bread as a sign of inter-communion which we saw Irenaeus recount was forbidden in the East in 365,[3] and after being practised by Zephyrinus (c. 203) and other popes of Rome and by other authorities in Italy it seems to have ceased about the eighth century in the West.[4] An Armenian canon of the fourth century forbade presbyters to take the sacred bread from the church and impart in houses to laymen.[5] The Council of Saragossa, 380, went so far as to declare that if any one was proved "not to have taken the grace of the Eucharist" as it is called "in church

[1] Quoted in D. L. Murray's *Reservation*, p. 10.

[2] Cyprian, "De Lapsis" 132 ed. Brem. quoted by Scudamore, art. "Reservation," *Dict. Christian Antiquities.*

[3] Council of Laodicea 365. See Note upon Euseb. Hist. Eccl. 5.24.15 by Wace and Schaff, and also Scudamore, art. "Eulogiae" in Smith and Cheetham's *Dict. of Christian Antiquities.*

[4] *Prayer Book Dictionary,*" by Geo. Harford and Morley Stevenson.

[5] Scudamore, article on "Reservation of the Eucharist," *Dict. Christ. Antiq.*

after receiving it," he should be "anathema for ever,"[1] and the Council of Toledo exactly a century after (which shows how difficult the practice was to extirpate) decreed that whoso committed that offence should be counted guilty of sacrilege and therefore expelled.[1]

But that was a prevention simply of practice. It did not attack the popular belief according to which, as J. H. Srawley[2] puts it, "the elements were identified with the sacred realities of which they were the vehicle." It was that belief which prompted the practice, and, remembering that our teaching is that belief is the root of conduct, and that true belief is the means by which we apprehend our salvation, the essential evil in the practice consequently was not touched. Nay, rather by this very forbidding it might be given more authority. For men might and no doubt did for that reason think: Our belief must be well-founded that, in itself and not simply as in some sense conveyant, the bread is the mystery.

[1] Scudamore, article on "Reservation of the Eucharist," *Dict. Christ. Antiq.*

[2] J. H. Srawley, art. "Eucharist," p. 549 in James Hastings's *Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics.*

Chapter VI.

THE FINAL CAPTURE

The earlier apartness.
The setting-in of a change.
The moment of the change.
The nature of the change.
The development of the new conception.
The contradiction within the new conception.
How to discover meaning.
The conduct of those who held the new theory.
The Festival of Corpus Christi.
The Procession of the Festival.
The Council of Trent.
The procession of the reserved elements to the sick.

The Earlier Apartness

That, then was a splendid triumph for the bread and wine. Beginning simply as material elements, made use of to indicate the surety of a gift bestowed in certain circumstances, they had become the gift itself, let the circumstances be what they might. In the festival they represented the Lord's body and blood actually dispensed to the faithful for their consumption. They had become the Lord's body and blood in themselves for whoever might be regarding them and wherever they might be.

But there was as yet a limit. They were the Lord's body and the Lord's blood. In the Canon of the Mass how it was that the Lord called them such was brought before the communicant. The Lord was therein presented as handing them over, visible bread and wine to be taken, he himself visible outside His gifts. True indeed, His body was now not on earth but ascended and stationed in glory far overhead, yet He was believed to be present according to His promise to be present where two or three were gathered together in His name,[1] again, as at the Last Supper, handing

[1] Matt. xviii. 20.

His gifts. So, notwithstanding such welcoming songs, as we have noticed, to Him as entering when the bread and wine of a previous Communion were brought in at the Mass of the Pre-sanctified, yet in usual thought He and His gifts were apart, He at one point of space, or above space, and His gifts at another. He was not as yet within His gifts.

The Setting-in of a Change

But there came a change, and it came with a stronger realisation of the words "This is My body" "This is My blood" taken in their surface meaning, the circumstances in which they were uttered and on which they depended, let fall out of mind.

We may well ask ourselves how it was that the Canon of the Holy Communion setting the circumstances of the Institution before the communicant should have so lost its influence. Was it pronounced in that "distinct and audible voice" expressly required in the proposed revision of 1928 and always the ideal of our reformers? Was it always said? Was it said in a language understood by the people? We remember how the Church East and West clung to its old Greek and old Latin.

Also we may inquire regarding the words of administration. We know how the Reformers in the Church of the West in the sixteenth century remodelled them for the better understanding of the Church's communicants.

Whatever was done to make the true meaning of the Institution clear or whatever was not done, the fact is that the absolute meaning of the words had become dominant, and that now, that being so, the stronger realisation we are now approaching of the absolute meaning set in.

The Moment of the Change

In the ninth century the new process of thought began, we may say, with a monk, who was afterwards the Abbot of the Benedictine abbey[1] of Corbie on the Somme,

[1] "Founded in the seventury century, the church of which (16–18 century) is still to be seen, though now ruined" [*Encycl. Brit.*[14]].

Paschasius Radbertus, for his was the first notable and complete treatise on the new trend that had set in. It finished in the thirteenth with the famous Dominican, St. Thomas of Aquinas in Italy, who gave it, such as it was, its perfect expression.

Why was it that at that moment these words of the Lord that had been taken as we have seen more or less absolutely yet with a simple faith or a thoughtful reverence, came now to press with so vivid a realism on the simple-minded, and to excite into such a labyrinth of logic the thoughtful? It was the moment when a fresh inroad of wild tribes from the north cut across the northern mainland of Europe isolating the Christians beyond the Channel from their brethren on the Continent. To convert that invading body, eager missionaries went forth both from the isolated Christians beyond the Strait and the main body in central Europe. If these men met their death at times they were naturally regarded with awe by these wild folk, and behind the awe there was, probably wherever the missionary might come from, but certainly when he came from the imperial city, the secular power of Rome with its force and intellectual and romantic tradition. It was among these uncultured people, brought to a faith that held intimately within it so dominating a civilisation, that this mode of apprehension began.

The Nature of the Change

Whatever the cause, the original circumstances displayed in the Institution faded more and more from the mind of those who partook of the sacred elements, the apartness of the Lord from them as a spirit in the midst and they as material presented by him was no longer maintained in their mind. Rather what was dominant was his distance all-glorious and supreme above all things terrestrial at his Father's right hand. Yet withal there was the remembrance of his birth in the flesh at Bethlehem.

No wonder then that the visible things on the altar which should presently come to the touch and taste, the

things that were called the Lord's body and blood, yet with the circumstance and context of that designation out of mind, should come to be realised more vividly, most vividly, to be what they were said thus absolutely to be. No wonder it came to pass with not a few as it did with Sir Galahad in Tennyson's *Idyll of the Holy Grail*, where one says:

"I saw
The holy elements alone";

but he, Sir Galahad protests:

"Saw ye no more?" . . .
"I saw the fiery face as of a child
That smote itself into the bread and went."

The Lord was no more for those who held this new intensity of thought outside His gifts. He was within them. Nay, more. These were His body and blood. So were these gifts Himself.

It would seem that it was really visions such as Tennyson pictures that fired the endeavour to find a rational support for the presence so conceived.

The reasonings of the thinkers pursued an ever richer course that ended in a development in Aquinas that became authoritative.

The Development of the New Conception

Once started it developed astonishingly under the influence of the Scholastics, first the Platonists and then those who were taken up with the newly-discovered logic of Aristotle. It came to be systematised, arranged in a harmony of its own, like a rich and splendid flower—a presentation of sacramental belief that has proved to be an entrancement.

The Contradiction within the New Conception

Not that there were not those who criticised and hotly repudiated the elaboration and suffered for their plain speaking, and not that by those who did uphold the new

conception there was not confessed a contradiction in what they taught between theory and fact that gave tribute to the opposition.

This inner contradiction both the early enthusiast in the country monastery at Corbie, whom one recent critic at all events holds to be "no metaphysician,"[1] and the equally enthusiastic completer of the theory, Aquinas, the great lecturer at the famous schools of Paris and Cologne, who was very much of a metaphysician, quite frankly state.

Paschasius of Corbie declares the change to be an inward one. It is not apparent to sight or taste. If the elements retain their outward appearance, the object is to call forth faith and to remind believers that the gift is spiritual. He repudiates the view that the Jews in the 6th Chapter of St. John (vi. 52) are presented holding, which was apparently held by some in his day. Berengar, we note by the way—Berengar who was a martyr for the Scriptural view, not as was our Cranmer in a brief controversy of forced avowal and final recovery and then fire at the stake, but by a long-drawn agony caused by the insistence of the authorities of eight-and-thirty years that ended in an eight years' silence on an island on the Loire, where he died, near the Cathedral of Tours, where he had been head of the teaching staff—testifies that, in the century just before him, the tenth, the century after Paschasius, expressions were current which countenanced that revolting belief. Yet Paschasius, aware of and contemning that Capernaite view, brings forward Old and New Testament miracles to support the belief that change of the bread and wine into the flesh and blood of Christ there is, and adduces instances of that very outward appearance as in his belief actually brought about by miracle to convince doubters and reward faith. Yet, we are to note, he will not have it that the unfaithful receive the Body and Blood.

And St. Thomas Aquinas thus expresses what the bread

[1] J. H. Srawley in *Eucharist*, p. 556 in J. Hastings's *Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics*, from which the account here given of Paschasius's treatise is taken.

and wine become: "At the recital of the words of Christ by the priest—'This is My body, this is My blood,' the substances of the bread and wine are converted into the substance of the body and blood of Christ. This conversion is not formal but substantial. All the accidents [*that is* qualities] of the bread and wine remain in actual reality, discerned by the senses, but their substance has been converted. This conversion, being thus not formal but substantial, it can therefore be called by the distinctive name Transubstantiation, and, there being thus present in the consecrated Sacrament the real body and blood of Christ, the consecrated Sacrament is to be adored."[1]

Then St. Thomas thus corrects himself: "The body of Christ is in the Sacrament spiritually and invisibly by the power of the Holy Ghost. It is not in the Sacrament as a body in a place but in a certain special way, which is peculiar to this sacrament. The presence is not affected by any local movement. The change made by consecration is not like any natural change but is wholly supernatural. The body of Christ is in the Sacrament by way of substance, not by way of quantity, nor by way of dimensions, nor so that it is limited or circumscribed. As concerning place, Christ in Himself, that is according to His own being, is not moved, but moved only by way of accident, and for the reason that He is not in the Sacrament as in a place, for that which is not in a place is not moved in itself in place, but only in relation to the movement of that wherein it is. The body of Christ is not locally in the Sacrament of the altar."[2]

How to discover Meaning

Now when we find people making contradictory statements, as Paschasius has just done in saying that the taking of the Body and Blood of Christ was dependent on a change in the bread and wine, and yet that the unfaithful partaking the bread and wine did not partake of Christ's body

[1] Darwell Stone, *History of the Doctrine of the Holy Eucharist*, I, p. 328–9.
[2] Id. I, p. 331.

and blood, or Aquinas that the body of Christ is in substance of the groups of accidents we see as bread and wine and yet is not in the bread and wine, an excellent plan is to watch what those who weave that "spider-web thinking" as our Lord Bacon called it, "admirable for its technical skill but of little use [save as a web]," not simply say but do.

The Conduct of those who held the New Theory

W. H. Freestone tells us that "up to a certain date, say the end of the tenth century, the ceremonial of the Church's processions seems to be directed more or less consciously against the demons of disease and the enemy of souls, but in the next century, the eleventh, we find a change. It is in honour pre-eminently of the sacred species now carried in the procession that its lights are lighted and its censer of incense swung."[1]

Now that is the very century when Berengar wrote regarding the new mode of thought the letter to Lanfranc that brought the writer into the lengthy argumentation with the authorities, we have just noted, that was a life-martyrdom. And not only were the authorities, led by the Pope and Lanfranc, against the President of the Cathedral School of Tours, but so too, Srawley tells us,[2] was popular opinion. It is not for us to enter into the detail of Berengar's view, save to note that "he admitted a change (conversio) of the bread and wine into the body and blood of Christ in the sense that to those who receive them they are transformed by grace into higher powers or influences—into the true, the intellectual or spiritual body of Christ," and that the doctrine his adversaries insisted upon and forced him, to his horror but subsequent recantation, to signify his acceptance of, was that the bread and wine after consecration were "not merely a sacrament, but the true body and blood of Christ, touched and broken by the hands of the priests and ground by the teeth of the faithful,"[3]

[1] Freestone, *The Sacrament Reserved.*
[2] J. H. Srawley, art. "Eucharist" in E.R.E., previously quoted.
[3] *Encycl. Brit.*[11] art. "Berengarius."

and that Lanfranc's mode of putting it was: "The flesh of the Lord it is we receive in the sacrament hidden in the form of bread, and His blood which we drink under the appearance (sub specie) and taste of wine."[1] Lanfranc was an Italian jurist and had personally argued against Berengar before the Pope at Berengar's trial at Rome. Besides this theological argumentation he had as abbot of Bec in Normandy exercised diplomacy at Rome on behalf of his duke, and when his duke became William the Conqueror—diplomatic Conqueror is said to be the meaning of the term—and so after a battle became our king, we find Lanfranc ten years after appointed to be Archbishop of Canterbury. Then it was that, starting in England a period of richer ritual, he placed in the procession through his cathedral on Palm Sunday the consecrated elements of the sacrament in the stead of the Book of the Gospels, and as the sacred elements were thus borne past, bade the people worship. W. H. Freestone gives a long passage from the "Decrees for the Order of S. Benedict" which describes what on such occasions was done. It states that "the Body of Christ" is to be enclosed "in a shrine," and that, "as the bearers of the shrine pass along, all shall bow the knee, not all at once, but one by one, on each side, as the shrine goes by."[2] The Lord was brought along. Jesus, the bread His body, was worshipped as the bread passed by. So did the ritual show on which side the balance inclined.

The Festival of Corpus Christi

It would seem to be within Lanfranc's lifetime that the term transubstantiation to express the doctrine came to be used,[3] at any rate we find it before the middle of the next, the twelfth, century.[4] With this further progress of the doctrine we find a special Festival after a while appointed

[1] Written after 1063. See Freestone, p. 40.

[2] Freestone, pp. 259, 260.

[3] By St. Peter Damian of Ostia, ab. 1072. See PL. CXLV. 883. Gore, *The Body of Christ*, p. 116 n.

[4] Weingarten-Arnold say that the term is discovered first in sermon 93 of Hildebert, Archbishop of Tours, d. 1134 ("Zeittafeln").

for its celebration, to be known as the Festival of Corpus Christi (the Body of Christ). The foundation took place in the middle of the thirteenth century, the century of St. Thomas Aquinas, at the hand of the then Bishop of Liege. The Bishop brought forward the visions of a certain nun years before in his diocese, who in ecstatic prayer had seen a hole in the moon, and through the hole had received a revelation that there would be in due time in the yearly round of the Church's Festivals a festival to celebrate this transubstantiation marvel, and the Bishop laid down that the Festival thus foretold from heaven should be brought into observance, fixing for it the Thursday after Trinity Sunday. It was not, however, until an archdeacon of Liege became Pope as Urban IV that from the Papal throne there came a bull commanding that the Festival be held throughout Christendom. We are told that pressure to make this proclamation had been put upon him from his old diocese and also that yet another miracle induced him, certified to him by the bishop of Orvieto, that a certain German-Bohemian priest sojourning at Bolsena in that diocese had doubted the reality of the manifestation thus celebrated, but was brought to belief by, as he celebrated the Holy Sacrament, beholding drops of blood appear upon the corporal cloth. In memory of that miracle the massive and marvellous cathedral now standing on the village green of Orvieto was erected in which the cloth as a precious relic is still preserved. A portrayal of the miracle may be seen in the Vatican as one of the frescoes of Raphael, in which the unbelieving priest is presented celebrating at the altar and the pope on the other side of it is looking at him reprovingly. A later pope at a Council at Vienne solemnly repeated the bull.

The Procession of the Festival

Then there came the linking of a procession with the Day by Pope John XXII. Soon this took to itself zealous competition of church pomp and secular splendour. Already the pope, Urban IV, who had given the original bull

enjoining the Festival had granted to those who shared in it great indulgences, and Martin V and Eugen IV added thereto. So the Festival of Transubstantiation and its Procession in which were carried the very body and blood of Christ became one of the most important of the Church.

The Council of Trent

The Council of Trent, holding its twenty-five sessions, 1545-1563, except for two years, at Trent in the fertile valley that runs down from the Southern Alps, assembled that it might condemn the errors of Luther and other heretics and draw up the true Confession of Faith for Christendom, emphasised all this. Among its Canons it published this with regard to the Doctrine of Transubstantiation: "If anyone shall say that in the most holy Sacrament of the Eucharist the substance of the bread and wine remains together with the body and blood of Christ, and shall deny that wonderful and unique conversion of the whole substance of the bread into the body and of the whole substance of the wine into the blood, the species of bread and wine only remaining, which conversion the Catholic Church most suitably calls Transubstantiation, let him be anathema."[1]

And to the Procession that made manifest the Doctrine to the very eyes of onlookers the Council gave a distinctively propagandist character, publishing regarding it this Decree: "It shall be that over lies and heresy the Truth shall triumph; that those who hold themselves contrary to this display shall at a glance at such splendour and at such jubilant rejoicing here made by the Church gathered together, be struck down, lamed and broken, and perish or with shame and confusion on their faces at last come to reason."[2]

The festival still sends, we are told, "processions of white-robed and flower-laden children through the streets of

[1] Darwell Stone, work previously quoted, Vol. II, p. 91.

[2] "Fronleichnamsfest" in Schiele and Zscharnack's *Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart.*

half-Europe"[1]; yet we can understand how these assertive processions of the populace, holding high, as they do, that round which for all Christians thought the most holy and reverend gathers, yet advertising in such a manner a regard for it discovered by so many to be inconsistent with its institution and incongruous with a true devotion, must arouse horror in those who think so; and also, as the paradings of a rival secular power, the which the Church of Rome, influenced by her early association with Caesardom, has for ages long claimed to be—the active antipathy of statesmen.

The Procession of the Reserved Elements to the Sick

If the greater procession thus came to be held and grew in splendour, the lesser processions meanwhile were not forgotten, even the humble procession of taking the reserved elements to the sick. We find our Archbishop Peckham of Canterbury giving order in his Constitutions which date from the year 1279 that a light and a bell be borne before the stoled priest, who should carry the host to the sick so that the people thus duly aroused might prostrate themselves "wherever the King of Glory might be carried about under his lurking place of the bread (sub panis latibulo)."[2]

[1] See Rome Correspondent's account in *Manchester Guardian*, 9th June, 1926, of the Festival as held at Orvieto.

[2] *Church Gazette* (National Church League), Nov., 1925, pp. 124–5.

Chapter VII.

WESTCOTT MISUNDERSTOOD

A look back.
Apprehensions.
Westcott's letter to his Chancellor.

A look back

Let us look back, past the review we have taken in the last two chapters of these strange misunderstandings, to our picture of Westcott in the upper room of the Divinity School describing to those who had come to sit at his feet the Perfect Humanity (which the Gift with which we are in this book concerned really is) the height he deemed all those who had received the message of the Incarnation should realise themselves to be established upon, the height on which accordingly—to note next Westcott as Diocesan and the problem of how to adopt Justin's use set before him to solve—those who received the Body and Blood of that Perfect Humanity should feel their standing confirmed, be they Christians at Rome in the early days of the Church receiving at the hands of the deacons, as Justin described, the bread and wine over which thanks had been given, dispatched from the assembly, or those who received the same this long way down the centuries in this distant island of the West at the hands of one of the Clergy who had been assisting at the Open Service in their parish church. The same method was to be carried out for the absentee of to-day as had been adopted for the absentee of that far-away yesterday, the same blessed fellowship made thereby afresh for the receiver.

Apprehensions

Yet there were apprehensions, as we have seen, in Westcott's mind. Fears arose also in the minds of others. The value of Justin's method began to be debated. Objections to it were mooted. The bright vision of the little company at Durham as it was transported across the country became somewhat beclouded, and the Bishop found he had to make clear what he meant.

Westcott's Letter to the Chancellor of his Diocese

We find him accordingly in a letter to the Chancellor of his Diocese referring to a speech that he had made at the Convocation of York, explaining his view and mode of procedure. The speech had not been published at the date of the letter, and he complains to his Chancellor that at a hearing before the Archbishops of Canterbury and York at Lambeth, when council on each side argued before them whether or not Reservation for extra-liturgical administration of the material elements used in the Holy Communion was or was not a practice permitted in the Church of England, his action had been to his great astonishment misunderstood.

Auckland Castle, 18 July, 1899.

My dear Chancellor—I have just seen, with great surprise, that Mr. Hansell stated in his address at Lambeth that I have authorised Reservation in certain cases. I have not done anything of the kind. What I have done is that I have endeavoured to show how the cases in which Reservation is declared to be necessary may be met without Reservation. In two cases I have allowed incumbents, who have applied to me, to adopt the following usage, which I believe to be legal, as it is certainly primitive. Immediately after the consecration, one of the assistant-clergy may take the elements to the sick person, so that administration to the sick may be coincident with the administration to the congregation. The sick person, in

fact, is to be treated as a member of the congregation. This, I hold, is what Justin Martyr describes. I further directed that the sick person should be enabled, by the assistance of some friend, to follow the service so as to be prepared to receive in due course. The usage was to be adopted only in exceptional cases. I stated my view at York Convocation in May, but the report has not yet been published. Whether the usage is legal or not, it certainly excludes Reservation and does not authorise it. There is, indeed, no question on which I feel more strongly, and I cannot understand how my action has been misinterpreted. I insisted strongly, in both cases, on the fact that there should be no Reservation. It is clear to me that Justin Martyr describes coincident, and not subsequent administration to the absent.

Yours most truly,

B. F. Dunelm.[1]

[1] *Life* II, 274.

Chapter VIII.

WESTCOTT'S VICTORY

THE NEED OF A DECISION.
THE TWO IDEALS OF DISPENSING THE SACRED ELEMENTS.
THE CENTRAL AIM OF EACH IDEAL.
THE RELATION OF EACH METHOD TO THE CELEBRATION.
A CRITICISM.
THE PETITIONERS' AXIOM.
THE ADVANTAGES OF HAVING THE ELEMENTS RESERVED.
THE ARCHBISHOPS APPEALED TO TO GIVE THEIR OPINION.
GENERAL DEFINITION OF THIS FORM OF ADMINISTRATION.
ITS DIFFERENT MODES.
THE REASONS FOR RESERVATION STATED AT THE HEARING OF THE PREVIOUS JULY.
THE OPINIONS OF THE ARCHBISHOPS WITH REGARD TO JUSTIN.
THE ESSENTIALS OF A CELEBRATION.
WESTCOTT'S VICTORY.
FURTHER STUDY OF JUSTIN ADVISABLE.
RESERVATION UNLAWFUL.

THE NEED OF A DECISION

EVIDENTLY a clearing-up both of Westcott's position and of the meaning and legality of Reservation in general was necessary.

THE TWO IDEALS OF DISPENSING THE SACRED ELEMENTS

That is shown both by the letter Westcott had to write which we have just presented, and also by the fact that certain priests were not satisfied with such an arrangement as Westcott's, and were in fact possessed of quite a different ideal. Inclusion, co-incidence, as we have just said was Westcott's aim. Their aim, on the other hand, was apartness and non-coincidence. They desired the bread and wine of the Communion to be put by so that individuals individually in such other place than the parish church as these individuals might happen to be in, and at some other time than that of the Celebration as might be convenient for those

concerned, might receive from them independently of the celebration at which the bread and wine had been consecrated.

The Central Aim of each Ideal

The contrast between this desire and Westcott's will be at once apparent. The Bishop, with his ideal of inclusive humanity, had his eye upon the body of communicants desiring it to be as properly complete as might be, both by the encircling of the absentee into its visible outline by Justin's method, and also by the absentee's being instructed to join as fully as might be in the prayers and Rule of the service as prescribed by the Church of England. These priests had their eye on the individual in his isolation. Also, for Westcott, the bread and wine were necessarily included within the whole transaction as the centre of it, needing the transaction for their meaning as the transaction needed them, while for those dissatisfied apellants, to whom we now allude, the bread and wine were to be set apart, removed from the transaction, and finally used as retaining, when administered thus, apart from the congregation and at another time and without the Rule [the Canon] being repeated or even definitely, as Westcott planned, brought to the mind of him who was ministered to, the same peculiar value they possessed when used in the service.

The Relation of each Method to the Celebration

These men in short wanted, whatever else the term might mean, just what was usually understood, and what Westcott understood, to be signified by the name Reservation, and we see at once how correct Westcott was when he said that his method of adopting Justin's use excluded the practice that they desired, for inclusion was so evidently the heart of his arrangement, both as regards the individual to whom the sacred elements were to be administered, the officiant of the service who administered, and the elements themselves, and exclusion was so evidently the heart of theirs. With Westcott all these components were to be kept

together as each needing the other, and all of them were to be comprised in the service of the Open Celebration. With those on the other hand who wanted what was universally recognised as Reservation, the Open Celebration was thought of as only bestowing on the bread and wine their peculiar value, there was no thought of the individual who was to be visited, or of the officiant who visited him, or of the sacred elements, as constituents in the Celebration, and, while these petitioners would have admitted that the individual visited, the officiant who ministered, and the sacred elements given, were to be regarded as mutually dependent, if the benefit of the ministration was to be realised, they nevertheless held the sacred elements to be peculiarly independent, as in themselves whether given or not, or received or not, and howsoever any might regard them, possessing still the value they possessed when administered in the congregation; and this independent value of the bread and wine of the Celebration was the main point on which they insisted.

A Criticism

This contention must seem strange to one who with a common-sense mind sums up the meaning of the Service, whatever value he may put upon the bread and wine when administered. He will, be he a believer in the wonderful gift bestowed, regard the placing of the bread and wine apart from the transaction wherein they receive their meaning, and the claiming for them retention afterwards of their value, to be just as if a surgeon should take the heart of a living man and lay it on his dissecting table by itself and say "There it is. Does it not still beat?"

The Petitioners' Axiom

Such however was the conviction of these men. They pointed to the Lord's words: "This *is* the body," "This *is* the blood." That was the imprimatur on the bread and wine for them. Pronounced to be these, these they must always be, so long as they were bread and wine in outward form.

THE ADVANTAGES OF HAVING THE ELEMENTS RESERVED

The advantages of this apprehension of value they set out in detail.

The sick man, they argued, gained thereby. There was no call to draw him somehow or other into the circle that met in Holy Communion. Here of course was just the opposite of Westcott's ideal. Nor need there be under such sanction any coincidence in time; at any moment, if only the bread and wine that were reserved lasted, the sick might receive them in their spiritual power. How important this was. Can a sick man choose his time? There might be sudden illness which called for immediate reception. Besides, with the Canon not used, how brief need be the accompanying prayer! What a benefit here when, as in a hospital ward, there were many sick to administer to!

There were advantages under this sanction to themselves also, they contended. They might choose their own suitable time for administering. Above all, their partaking of the elements with the sick man would no longer be necessary, and so they would not be required to maintain their fast, but might administer the already consecrated elements to him after they had taken food and so at any hour of the day or night.

Also, there was gain of avoidance of unseemliness toward the rite and the sacred gifts. The ceremony of reading the Canon and of the consecratory handling of the elements would then not have to take place in the possibly indecorous and certainly unconsecrated surroundings of the sick room. Certain minor special arrangements which they could make for the transportation and administration in the sick room would preserve such circumstantial respect as seemed due.

With such a belief in regard to the sacred elements in their mind, and keeping in view these advantages of the special use they desired these men made—to quote the report of the Archbishop of York when he gave the Opinion to be presently quoted—"earnest appeals again and again, during the discussions [which we noted in our last chapter]

that took place on the subject, to the Archbishops and Bishops not to deprive the sick and dying of the spiritual sustenance which is provided for them in the Holy Sacrament."

The Archbishops appealed to to give their Opinion

Accordingly, representatives of those who thought in this way, one representative in the Province of Canterbury, the other in the Province of York, made appeal to their respective Archbishops to give each their Opinion, and about a year after Westcott's protest against his being understood to approve of Reservation the two Archbishops met, namely on the Holy Day of St. Philip and St. James, the First Day of May, 1900, at Lambeth Palace, to consider the appeals. Frederick Temple, Archbishop of Canterbury, first gave his Opinion and explained that, immediately after he had concluded, the Archbishop of York would give his.

General Definition of this Form of Administration

As was evidently advisable in view of the uncertainty as to what really constituted Reservation, the Archbishop of Canterbury began by laying down a practical definition of what at the present day Reservation was understood to mean. He said "The question referred to our consideration is whether the clergy of the Church of England are at liberty to reserve a portion of the bread and wine that has been consecrated in their churches at the Holy Communion, and the administration of it to those who are not present in church at the time when the Prayer of Consecration has been said. This practice," he said, "is commonly spoken of as Reservation."

The Different Modes

He then pointed out that this mode of administration took three distinct forms. "In the first place," he said, "it is sometimes the practice to treat sick persons who are not in the Church, but are living close by, as if they were part of the Congregation, and at the time of administration

to the Communicants generally, to take the elements out of the Church to them as well as to those who are actually present. It is claimed that this is not Reservation at all, inasmuch as the administration goes on without interruption." With regard to that claim he went on at once to say, "and it cannot be said that what is sent in this way is part of what remains after the service is over."

"The second form of the practice is," he continued, "instead of consuming all that remains of the consecrated elements as the Rubric directs, to keep a portion back and to administer this portion to people known to be sick at some later period of the day. This is acknowledged by all to be Reservation, and the reserved elements are kept in the Church until the time when they are taken to the sick.

Thirdly, the elements after consecration are sometimes reserved, not only to be used for those who are known to be sick at the time, but to be used for any case of sudden emergency which may occasion a demand for the sacrament in the course of the week."

The Reasons for Reservation, stated at the Hearing of the previous July

The Archbishop of York, William Dalrymple Maclagan, began his Opinion by referring to the Hearing before the Archbishops the previous July when the counsel on behalf of those who desired Reservation had stated that the Bishop of Durham, the hero of our story, had allowed it on certain occasions, which drew from Westcott the letter of protest we have quoted. At that hearing the clergyman who now made his appeal to be permitted the practice had given, Dr. Maclagan reported, his evidence with great fulness and clearness, and had stated that he had already practised the custom in his parish for the past five years, and that for him to use the Office appointed by the Church for the Communion of the Sick would be (to quote the Archbishop's account of his plea) "a very severe strain upon him because of his conscientious objection ever to receive the Holy Communion unless he were technically fasting, and that

he could not celebrate, as the said clinical office of the Church required him to do, without himself receiving." The archbishop then set forth in detail certain contentions of the counsel for Reservation at the Hearing in July, mentioning among them that, as we have noted in this essay, it was on Justin Martyr Westcott built up the practice allowed by him and for which he was in fact, if the limits he laid down were observed, enthusiastic, so also on Justin Martyr the counsel for the clergyman who desired permission to reserve rested his plea, contending that Justin Martyr's account was a proof that Reservation had been practised in the Church of Christ from very early times. The words which the counsel drew special attention to in Justin's account were: "portions were carried away to those who were not present." Here then was each side basing its use on Justin.

The Opinions of the Archbishop with regard to Justin

With both parties thus claiming sanction from this ancient authority Archbishop Maclagan then weighed the value of the claim with care on each side of the balance. He said: "It is very difficult to understand the exact meaning of Justin's statement. Except for him indeed we know very little of the religious services of the Church at that early period, or of the circumstances attending the celebration of the Eucharist. There is no mention, we will notice, by him of the sick, but simply of the absent. Nor is there any suggestion of what is now included under the idea of Reservation, for the portions were sent away from the church immediately after the conclusion of the service, or possibly while the service was still proceeding. It was, therefore, more an extended ministration of the Sacrament than any Reservation in the modern sense of the word. There is, besides, no conclusive evidence that these distributed portions really constituted part of the consecrated elements, although it is, of course, possible that this may have been the case. But, even granting that this is the meaning of the words, it is a very slender and uncertain basis upon

which to build up the contention that this was a Catholic practice of the Church of Christ."

That was a rather chilling résumé of what had on each side kindled so much enthusiasm.

The Archbishop of Canterbury had already in his Opinion, as we have seen, alluded to the practice arranged by Westcott, classifying it under the first of three forms that were commonly intended when Reservation was spoken of, namely the taking to sick persons not in the church but living close by of the elements at the time of the administration to the congregation, and had declared with regard to it that the claim was justified that such an arrangement was not Reservation at all. Justin's mention of such a use showed, he maintained, that it was common at Justin's time, and, he observed, not only for the sick, but for any who were absent.

The opinions of the two archbishops therefore gave support to Westcott's protest. Justin's method, they held, was not Reservation.

The Essentials of a Celebration

And also in a certain important positive regard the Bishop of Durham's arrangement was allowed in those Opinions. We shall remember that the coincidence Westcott required was not only that immediately after the consecration prayer one of the assistant-clergy should take the elements to the sick, so that the administration to the sick and the administration to the congregation might be as nearly as possible coincident, but also that the sick person should be enabled by some friend to follow the service so as to be prepared to receive in due course intelligently when the assistant-clergyman should arrive. That meant that the sick absentee should have in ear and mind, if not actually before his eyes (holding, as we may imagine, the prayer-book in his hand), the Canon of the Institution of the Eucharist, just as if he were present in church with his brethren and was hearing it read by the celebrant. With reference to that, the Archbishop of Canterbury stated in

his Opinion that what was essential in the administration of the Sacrament, was that the said Canon as being the Prayer of Consecration, should be read, and the words of Administration be pronounced. There might be used in addition what preceded these in the Service, and what followed, so far as the time prescribed by medical direction allowed, but these, the Canon of Institution and the Administrative words, were "essential to having any Communion at all," and if Canon and Administrative Words "were not possible, it could hardly be said that the sick person was capable of receiving."

Westcott's Victory

So Westcott had his victory, both the negative victory that Justin's method was not Reservation, and the positive victory that what were, he felt, essentials of the service should be brought, as they were set forth in the Prayer-book, to the mind of the sick absentee.

Yet, further study of Justin advisable

Yet, as we have noted, those who desired Reservation, as well as Westcott who opposed it, appealed to Justin as giving them a precedent: and already no doubt the reader has noticed loopholes, shown to him independently or by the statements we have given of the Archbishops, that make Justin not so clear a witness for the practice either of the parties claimed to be actually his.

Reservation Unlawful

As to Reservation itself each archbishop declared it to be contrary to the formularies of the Church of England, the Archbishop of Canterbury stating this regarding the 28th Article: "The language of the 28th Article cannot be taken otherwise than as condemning the practice altogether. To say that 'the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper was not by Christ's ordinance reserved, carried about, lifted up, or worshipped,' is to say that those who do these things use for one purpose what our Lord ordained for another."

Chapter IX.

WHERE LUTHER HALTED

Should we not bring Luther into the succession of the objectors?

No. He held the absolute interpretation of the words of Christ.

Luther stood where Lanfranc stood.

Not only his way of regarding the Lord's Words, but Fear also compelled Luther.

Yet the Ascension was a difficulty.

The difference of the impression made upon Westcott when he viewed the Ascended Lord.

Luther's reason for objecting to the Corpus Christi Procession.

How did Luther regard this process of enclosing (as we feel we must put it) the Body and Blood of the Lord in the materials of His Sacrament?

Should we not bring Luther into the succession of the Objectors?

Did one not know the actual fact one would think to place him among its opponents to take his part with Bertram, who, in the very monastery where Paschasius Radbertus was a fellow-monk, wrote his treatise against it, and with Berengar, the president of the Cathedral School of Tours, who by his letter in its disfavour to Lanfranc, brought himself into the long interplay of passionate argument that had to end in his spending his last years retired and in silence.

And we should have reason to place Luther there, not only because of his sturdy protestation against much into

which the Church had drifted, but especially because, first, he objected to scholasticism in general and was intent upon a new method, an appeal simply to Holy Scripture; and, secondly, because he particularly disbelieved the theory of Transubstantiation. He maintained that Holy Scripture showed that the Lord was giving bread to be eaten and wine to be drunk. So had neither of these material elements, as such, of the Sacrament lost its substance, as scholasticism required.

Yet it is in the line of thought that scholasticism so wrongly, in his own opinion, followed, that we must place him, not indeed, since he objected to Transubstantiation, at its climax, but at a certain point beneath that.

Luther held the Absolute Interpretation of the Words of Christ

Why is this? Because he held the absolute view of the Lord's words, the view we have just seen the petitioners in the last chapter hold, the view that takes the Lord's words at their surface meaning, apart from the circumstances of their utterance, the apprehension of them on which is founded all the elaboration we have been reviewing.

That he held this view he made known dramatically at the last attempt to bring to a unanimous statement of belief the two differing parties of the early reformers—in Marburg Castle in October 1529. Certain of the leaders at first privately conferred, then they and other leaders met for the public disputation. Before the public argument began, Luther pushed back the table-cloth and before the eyes of all wrote in chalk upon the table "Hoc est corpus meum," ("This is My body"), and declared that from these words, however much he might be pressed, he would not move. There then, before the company, the mysterious announcement lay, flung down like a gauntlet, a formula by itself, with none of the circumstances in which the words were originally said presented, *literae scriptae* with none of the context thereof.

Luther stood where Lanfranc stood

So then for Luther the bread and wine of the Sacrament were in the absolute unlimited meaning of the verb "to be," the Lord's body and blood. There, to the common-sense interpreter of Scripture, Luther seems to forsake his determination to make the Scripture itself a sufficient test. On the other hand, coming to the common-sense interpretation, he maintained that the Scripture required that the bread and wine, since they were dispensed to be eaten and drunk, should be in their substance bread and wine. According to his view, therefore, when the bread and wine were administered, two substances were dispensed, of the bread and of the body, of the wine and of the blood. The body of the Lord was "in et sub" ("in and under") the bread, the blood of the Lord "in et sub" ("in and under") the wine. He used, it will be noticed, the very prepositions that Lanfranc had used. Not an inch further would he creep down the airy ladder which the scholastics had raised to what they deemed to be the height required. There he stood, just at the point at which that life-long assailant of Berengar stood in the day when the ladder was raised only so far. The two substances being thus placed together, "con-substantiation" came to be the name that his followers after his death gave to his theory.

Not only his way of regarding the Lord's words, but Fear also compelled Luther

But it was not only Luther's determination to stand by the Lord's words literally taken, as he thought they must be taken, that brought him only so far down the scholastic ladder. Fear compelled him to halt where he halted. Luther's heart was full charged with the sense of sin. It was chiefly his conviction of the futility the Church's declaration of remission of sins, that compelled him to nail his 95 sentences of challenge to the Church on the door of the Castle-church at Wittenberg[1] for all to read. The evils

[1] See Weingarten-Arnold, *Zeittafeln*, p. 110, 3.

he so nobly combated in the Church were distressing enough: the visits of the Arch-enemy who instigated men in these evil ways, and sought by these visits to hinder him in his fight on behalf of the Gospel, were terrible indeed; but darkest and most terrible of all was the condition of his own heart and the essential weakness of his own will. For years he had striven to escape from his abject condition into the life that God would accept. He had passed what he calls "many years of bitter suffering" in contemplating on the one hand the radical wickedness of the human heart, and on the other the perfect righteousness that alone could please God,[1] and in seeking to obtain a gracious God who would enable his justification. In this matter the human will, he maintained, was utterly ineffective. Indeed he thanked God that God had "removed his salvation beyond the power of his own will and had charged His divine will with it, and had promised to save him not by his own works and ways but by God's grace and mercy," through the merits and death of His son.

With a mind so attuned Luther pondered over the Sacrament. He noted how the Lord there said, when He gave the bread "This is My body which is given for you," when He gave the cup "This cup is the new covenant in My blood, which is poured out for many for remission of sins." On the last assurance the penitent oppressed with his burden fixed his attention. So was for him remission of sins the chief glory of the Sacrament; but where in the Sacrament was remission of sins, if the Body of the crucified was not in the bread and His Blood that was shed was not in the cup? Just in that for which he depended upon it, it would then be found arid and vacant.

The Ascension, a difficulty

Yet here was a difficulty. Luther, as the whole Church and with an emphasis peculiar to themselves the reformers who were in Luther's succession, upheld the Lord's glorious Ascension. So then had Christ in His body ascended. He

[1] James McKinnon, *Luther and the Reformation*, III, 267, etc.

was now in session at His Father's right hand. How then could His body and blood be in the bread and wine? This at first was a great difficulty to Luther; but at last he came to a solution. He discovered on reflexion that God's right hand must be everywhere. He laid this down as one of the axioms of his belief, and it came to be known as the "Ubiquity-doctrine." Since God's right hand was everywhere, it was in the bread, and so might the body of His Son, now stationed in heaven at His right hand, be believed to be there. That reflexion fortified him.

The Difference of the Impression made upon Westcott when he viewed the Ascended Lord

Noticing Luther's fear we are struck with the different impression upon Westcott when he beheld the Ascended Lord.

Luther looked up and saw Christ in His glorified body, the body of a sinless and perfect humanity, lifted up far above him, at a height stupendous, and the immensity of distance between him and the Saviour appalled him. He was relieved to discover that God's right hand must be everywhere, therefore the body and blood thus enthroned, although, when viewed thus, far away, were nevertheless in the bread and the wine that were before him, handled and partaken of. Do not the words of Scripture still stand? he claimed—"This is My Body; this is My Blood," albeit the Body and Blood were glorified.

Westcott also looked up. He too saw Christ in His glorified body on the crown of all space; but withal not on a summit of upward measurement. He warns us thus: "We are not to think of the Ascension of Christ as of a change of position, of a going immeasurably far from us. It is rather a change of mode of existence, a passing to God, of Whom we cannot say 'there' rather than 'here.'"[1]

For Westcott then the height was entirely spiritual. All material measurement must be abandoned. It was indeed the same height that Luther had before him, the condition

[1] *The Historic Faith*, p. 80.

of absolute sinlessness and righteousness that, the distracted man in his cell discovered, must be attained if a man would stand before God, only Luther at the moment we are speaking of was weaving measurement into it.

For his "measure-conception" Westcott would accordingly have found fault with Luther, but he would have commended him for his sense of awe. None more than Westcott was filled with a sense of the awfulness of the Divine Glory and the exceeding majesty of the Person of Christ, the Personality of the Lord being distinctively for him—a definition for which he thanked scholasticism—in the Lord's Divine Nature.[1] But he would have pointed out that the Father had lifted up our human nature to the height, and it was imperative for us to cast away fear and rise up to it.

Also, he would have agreed with Luther that we must attain to that height if we would be acceptable to God, but—if we may venture the supposition—we believe that Westcott would have sided with Erasmus rather than Luther on the question of the part or no part the will should take in the flight upward. He would have marked for strong disapproval—a statement of his mind for which there is abundant evidence in this book—the assertion of Luther's that God had taken the attainment of our salvation out of our will and transferred it entirely to His own will. All was of God, he would have acknowledged: but God had given us free will and it was imperative that we should recognise the fact. Did the ascent seem impossible? Let Luther remember his own doctrine of Justification by Faith.

As to Luther's contention that the body and blood of the Lord were in the bread and the wine, we shall presently see how strong was our Master's objection to that, and just for the preservation in the mind of these matters of faith, the Lord's majesty and the need and gift of a perfect humanity, which so concerned our zealous reformer.

[1] *Gospel of Life*, p. 56.

We may be thankful indeed, when we think of all this, and recognise the need of the upward look, yet not as to a region appallingly high, dissuading our ascent thither, but rather as to a region the sight of whose glory and the Saviour there by God's throne, our nature in Him secure from all evil, bestirs our heart to rise up to it, that our reformers should have set so definitely before believers, each Ascension-tide, when the Church glories in the exaltation of Christ, the endeavour to make their own exaltation, expanding the Gregorian Collect for Ascension Day—"grant that we may also [as Christ has] into the heavens ascend and with Him continually dwell,"[1] and adding to their translation of the Sarum Collect for the Sunday after Ascension these words "[send Thine Holy Ghost to comfort us] and exalt us unto the same place whither our Saviour Christ is gone before."

Luther's Reason for objecting to the Corpus Christi Procession

But why, holding the view he held, did Luther object to the Corpus Christi procession? Certainly he did not believe the doctrine of Transubstantiation which the Festival of Corpus Christi was founded to celebrate. But, apart from that, the procession was an emphatic witness to the belief that the elements as looked upon were in some sense—why not as he himself understood?—the very Body and Blood of the Lord. Lanfranc, as we have seen, holding just Luther's view, had, when he came to England, introduced a procession of the sacred elements in his cathedral.

Luther's objection, however, to the procession of the materials of the Eucharist went back to the Institution. He accepted in its full implication the teaching of Chrysostom and other fathers of the East: "Believe," said that great authority, "that the Supper we celebrate to-day is that very Supper in which Jesus Christ acted. The sacred meal we now hold is in no point different from the meal that was held then. We are not to think that it is man

[1] The Latin is "ipsi quoque mente in celestibus habitemus."

who gets ready the supper we now celebrate, but Jesus Christ Himself dispensed that supper. Both meals, the meal then and the meal of to-day, are His own peculiar work. So, when thou seest the priest reach forth to thee the bread and wine, think not it is the act of the priest thou seest, but rather that it is Christ Himself who puts forth His hand."[1]

A. Naegle in a monograph on the Eucharistic Doctrine of St. Chrysostom thus puts the great Church father's affirmation: "Through the words of the institution Christ has at the first celebration of the eucharistic secret performed the act of consecration, and in doing so performed it to the end of time. Thereby through all our subsequent elaborations of the eucharist there runs like a scarlet thread the ground-thought that at the festival we hold to-day the unseen consecrator, even Jesus Christ, comes into outward manifestation in the priesthood on which we now place our eyes."[2]

It was just this view that Luther held, but he drew a deduction that Chrysostom apparently did not draw. Chrysostom, counselling both priest and communicant that it was only at the Lord's hand that the bread and wine were given as His body and blood, did not realise that that precluded a change in the elements taking place previously. But that conclusion Luther drew. At no point in the service until when the Lord, who was believed to be present with the two or three gathered together in His name, presiding now, as He had been presiding, at His Last Supper, Himself delivered the bread and the wine with the words that accompanied, were these His body and blood and, when that act of the Lord was over, these materials that He used were devoid.

Thus the danger of priestly presumption was precluded. Also, with the disappearance of their sacramental value before and after the Lord's use of them, all reason for their

[1] Chrysostom Hom. 50 in Mt.; Mg. 58, 507; quoted in *Die Stellung Christi im liturgischen Gebet*, by J. A. Jungmann, pp. 216–17.

[2] Passage in A. Naegle's *Die Eucharistielehre des hl. Johannes Chrysostomus, des Doctr. Eucharistiae*, quoted on p. 216 of Jungmann.

adoration before that moment and for their Reservation after it was taken away. So—to come to our immediate point—the grand Corpus Christi procession became, as Luther puts it, not only worldly but "blasphemous." It was the bearing aloft of a figment. It implied non-recognition of the essential fact that only while under the hand of the Lord could the elements possess their peculiar power.[1]

[1] This agrees of course with the use of water in Holy Baptism: and, if departed from, makes a difference between the two Sacraments. The Catechism of the Roman Council of Trent (1545-1563) boldly takes the difference for granted. "All the other [of the seven] Sacraments are perfected by the use of their matter, that is by their administrations; Baptism, for instance, becomes a Sacrament when the ablution is actually being performed; but to the perfection of the Eucharist the consecration of the elements suffices; for, though reserved in a pyx, either of the elements ceases not to be a Sacrament." One may ask what authority the Council of Trent has for making the difference.

Chapter X.

THE POSITION OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND

The three notable figures in the Reformation concerned with our line of thought.
Luther and Zwingli.
Calvin.
The response of the Church of England.
The strong and lasting influence of Luther.
Yet the individuality of the English Reformation.
The England of Henry VIII opposed to Luther.
The Increasing suppression of Lutheranism.

With regard to this clearance of view as to place of the bread and wine in the bestowal of the Eucharistic gift, what was the position of the Church of England?

The Three Notables

As we think out an answer to this question three notable figures of the Reformation arise. The first is Luther, the second—Zwingli, and the third—Calvin.

Luther and Zwingli

We have seen Luther's view—that the body and blood of Christ were substantially in or under the bread and wine. It was just on this point that Luther broke with Zwingli, who represented the opposing party at the Conference we have noted that took place at the Castle at Marburg on October 1–4, 1529. Fourteen Articles of belief had been agreed to, but when the fifteenth and concluding Article on the Lord's Supper was presented, the form Zwingli offered was found unacceptable. Over that he was

moved to tears, and exclaimed that there were no people on earth he would more gladly be at one than the theologians of Wittenberg, but with the words "You have another spirit than we" Luther thrust back Zwingli's hand, while Melanchthon, Luther's colleague at Wittenberg—to quote Butzer's account—"threw cold water"[1] upon Zwingli's advance.

It is not for us here to investigate Zwingli's view, either what he stated at the conference or what his ultimate expression of his doctrine was, but he has come now at any rate to represent those who regard the Lord's Supper as simply a commemoration; not as we saw Chrysostom insist upon and Luther likewise, a coming-again of the first celebration as a present fact with all its spiritual energies, but simply a remembrance of a historic event, whose powers, whatever they were then, are a matter of the past now, greatly stirring the soul, but only with the memory of them. Whatever the significance of the material elements when the Lord employed them, however true that He was still with the two or three met in His name, His body and blood were now in heaven and in no sense could they be said to be given to us on earth. Such seems to be a fair presentation of the way in which Zwingli regarded the Holy Communion: and if so, we can quite understand how Luther felt there was no mere difference of expression of belief between them, but a difference of spirit.

That there was some justification for this refusal of Luther's of further collaboration of Zwingli with Wittenberg is shown by the fact that Erasmus, the broadly-sympathetic Erasmus, in whose editions of the New Testament Zwingli rejoiced as opening his eyes, and with whom, as a much-wished for although rather chilling patron, he had held correspondence, declared himself much disturbed when he read Zwingli's first considerable treatise, Architeles, written in 1522.[2]

[1] Butzer in his account: frigidum infundente prae aliis Philippo Melanchthon [Weingarten, *Zeittafeln*].

[2] Weingarten.

Calvin

But, thirdly, there was of the new generation after these two disputants middle-aged in the great controversy,[1] Calvin, a young Frenchman, born in 1509 at Noyon in Picardy, destined by his father for ecclesiastical life, placed by him in good training, becoming a brilliant scholar, well-acquainted with scholastic theology and a strong debater, with his chief interest at first in Latin classics, then a preacher and lecturer, and, having been brought into touch with evangelical families, drawn more and more to the doctrine of the reformers, and experiencing in 1533 or so (some four years it will be noticed after the above-mentioned Marburg Conference) and so for him a year or so before at the age of twenty-five he would, in the normal course, have been ordained to the priesthood,[2] what he called his "sudden conversion," which he attributed to the direct action of God, after which his heart was "so subdued to docility" that he regarded all his former studies with comparative indifference, and many flocked to hear from him, beginner though he was, the pure doctrine, a contrast in what we may call a normal evangelical progress in his personal life and in his ministry, on the one hand to the fiery zealot of Wittenberg, so perturbed in the depths of his being over his own abject sin and the manifestly evil practices into which the Church of his day had fallen, and on the other hand to the somewhat cold humanist, Zwingli, who attacked contemporaneously the same evils, had arrived independently at Luther's doctrine of justification by faith, taught more thoroughly than Luther the need of dependence on Holy Scripture,[3] but moved all the time on the parallel line of what one might almost call an unrelieved rationalism.

Each of these three, as we survey his history, can hardly be congratulated on the part he took in the politics of his day; and for the political cause he took up Zwingli gave

[1] Luther was born in 1483, Zwingli in 1484.

[2] *Encyl. Britt.*[11]

[3] See article on "Zwingli" in *Encycl. Brit.*[11]

his life. In the year 1531, just over two years after the Marburg Conference, he fell in battle at Capel, by his fall making the tractate he wrote, "Christianae fidei Expositio," dedicated to the King of France, to prove to be, what his successor Bullinger called it, his "Swan-song."

The very next year after Zwingli's death the reforming movement centred at Geneva began, of which, after a few years, Calvin came to be the distinguished leader. Luther came to hear of this new champion for the reformed cause who had in the fresh years of his youth so thoroughly thought out for himself the principles of Christian faith and polity, and seems to have viewed with interest his proceedings, taking up at all events no word against him. Not that Calvin hoped to succeed where Luther had failed. It was against his will that in 1541 he took part in certain discussions at Worms and Regensburg. These, however, afforded him the beginning of his friendship with Melanchthon.

Now Calvin held that the body and blood of Christ in the sacrament were in the heart of the faithful receiver.

The Response of the Church of England

What trace of all this do we find in the Church of England?

If Wiclif with his Lollards in England set the Reformation going, influencing John Huss who again influenced Luther, it was the other way when the Lutheran movement began. The continent rendered back in the measure of a rising tide the impulse it had received. In spite of counter-regulations Lutheran books came to England. Tyndale's translation of the Bible, with its preface and marginal notes dependent upon Luther,[1] found its way across the sea. But more important in these days of early printing was the visiting. Erasmus after learned wanderings in France and Italy, sojourned with distinguished patrons in England. From 1509 until in 1516, when he finally settled in Basel, he was resident at Cambridge, and the tower on the roof of Queens' College, where the great scholar pursued his studies and his

[1] Albert Hauck, *Deutschland und England in ihren Kirchlingen Beziehungen*, p. 56.

teaching, is never missed by the guide who takes visitors round. Cranmer paid a visit in 1532, the year before he became Archbishop of Canterbury, to Nurnberg, where he met Osiander[1] who had taken part in the Marburg Conference and other evangelical theologians. Butzer, who had been won over by Luther's personality and disputation, and had had correspondence with both Luther and Zwingli, was called in 1549 under Edward VI to England and became a Professor in Cambridge. What then do we find of the movement we have been describing reflected in the Church of England?

That is the question that Professor Hauck puts to himself in his lectures, given before the University of Upsala, in October, 1916, the middle of the Great War between Germany and the Allies, upon Germany and England in their Church relations,[2] acknowledging the emotions of the moment, but treating his subject with evident and admirable objectivity.

The strong and lasting influence of Luther

To answer his question the learned professor goes through our Thirty-Nine Articles (the Revised Articles of 1562–63) *seriatim*. The first two he finds to be simply a re-casting of articles in the Augsburg Confession. In other cases he finds dependence but not so complete, the greater or smaller part being taken out of the Augsburg confession, or in certain cases out of other German sources. Only fifteen out of the thirty-nine, that is, as he remarks, by far the smaller half, he discovers to be entirely without dependence upon the German reformers.[3]

He finds a somewhat similar result when he turns from Confessions of faith to the Prayer-book. A quarter of a century before had been taken in hand in England the composing of a new form of divine service, the German evangelical churches, he tells us, had worked for the solution of the

[1] Albert Hauck, *Deutschland und England in ihren Kirchlichen Beziehungen*.

[2] Work just cited. [3] Work cited, pp. 59, 60.

same task. So the English reformers had not to break open a new track when they altered their mediaeval liturgy, but followed the pattern laid down in Germany in such works as the "Nürnberg-Brandenburg Church Order" of 1533 and the "Cologne Agenda" of 1543. So has the Book of Common Prayer, the professor tells us, its modelling from the service-books of the German reformation and bears a Lutheran impress.[1]

Yet, the Individuality of the English Reformation

"Yet"—the lecturer adds this warning—"notwithstanding all that, the Church of Henry VIII and Edward VI was no *ecclesia Lutheranizans*. It preserved its own individuality. It was distinguished from the [Roman] Catholic Church by its dogma and the casting-off of the Papal primacy, from the evangelical-Lutheran by a constitution in which the elements of the Middle Ages lived on, and also by the Calvinistic elements taken into its doctrine. The Thirty-nine Articles, in spite of their dependence on Lutheran documents, are no Lutheran confession. Expressions of Augsburg are found there, but altered into a Calvinistic form. Especially the Christology and the doctrine of the Lord's Supper are not Lutheran. Luther's Ubiquity doctrine is expressly thrown over. Statements are made that do not go beyond Calvin's view. Yet we cannot designate the Thirty-Nine Articles Calvinistic, for Calvin's central doctrine, Predestination, fails to appear. Nevertheless, although from both the evangelical churches the English Church stands so clearly apart, we can count her, on account of her dogma, among the Protestant Churches of the Reformation."[2]

The England of Henry VIII opposed to Luther

An important point Professor Hauck brings out and lays stress on: that Henry VIII was no Protestant, nay an opponent of Luther and the Reformation. Originally,

[1] Work cited, p. 61.
[2] Work cited, pp. 61, 62.

Henry had just one effective grievance against the Pope, and that was that the Pope would not grant him a divorce. He estranged his realm from Rome, declaring himself "Supreme Head of the Church of England" in order to be able to gain eventually what he desired. But that meant that the Pope was suffered henceforth no more to have jurisdiction in England, that his revenues from England were stopped, and that the monasteries as institutions that upheld him were dissolved. "Yet," the professor warns us, "while Henry was fitted to allow such a Church reform as the humanists round him desired and strove for, yet to the Reformation, as the Germans comprehended it, he stood from the beginning entirely estranged. There was, as a matter of fact, not the point in his inner being from which the understanding of such a movement as the movement taking place on the continent—an affair born of the conscience—could take its rise. The impression the reformation gave him was that it was a revolutionary movement, and he accordingly sought to keep it far away from England. Indeed, to say that does not express his opposition strongly enough. He was a trained theologian, and he believed he was called upon to put his hand into the course of theological activities that went on. In his "Adsertio septem sacramentorum" of 1521 he comes forward as a defender of the Romish doctrine of the sacraments against Luther, the writing that brought to him and his successors the Papal title of honour, "Defensor Fidei," a document which found on the part of Luther a more than impolite, but a well-merited, repartee. Yet not the King only, but a leading ecclesiastic, be it noted, Bishop Fisher of Rochester, and an eminent statesman, Thomas More, besides, who was leader of the English humanists, expressed themselves as opponents of Luther. In official England, in short, Luther's fight against Rome found no response."

"All this," the Professor declares, "corresponded to the personality of the King and to the relations England then held to the Continent. One can say: It was to be expected

that the England of Henry VIII should be found on the counterside of the Reformation."

"Yet"—here was the marvel—"it was just this King who began the reformation of the Church of England. The contingent enters here perspicuously into the world's development as it does in but few other instances; and besides, it becomes immediately in this instance a driving wheel, that quickens the movement of things in general. Where was that contingency? It lay in the marriage relationships of the King." Then the learned Professor discourses on the royal divorce.[1]

The Increasing Suppression of Lutheranism

After a while the Professor proceeds to trace the difficult course of those who pressed for evangelical reform in England, in the midst of the influential opposition he has just described. The Archbishop of Canterbury, Cranmer, strove to do what he could. The first confession of faith was the Ten Articles of 1536. English writers, he says, have it that the King drew these up with his own hand: but he sees little probability in that, for he finds these Articles to be the work of a theologian who believes in, and is acquainted with, the German reformation. Evidently they are dependent on the Augsburg Confession and a work of Melanchthon's, and contain many leading views of the German reformers; and yet with the Reformation there is not full agreement. These specific Romish ideas and institutions are present: transubstantiation, the worship of the saints and images, prayers for the dead, the mass for souls and the like. The Ten Articles are "a confused mixture of evangelical and [Roman] Catholic convictions."

The next year, 1537, the so-called "Bishops' Book" appeared. Here again "dependence on German writings is unmistakable: but less evangelical in the Lutheran sense is this than the preceding Ten Articles." Of the points he notes, the lecturer emphasises the numeration of the sacraments as seven.

[1] Work cited, pp. 50, 51.

"The next year again, 1538, certain evangelical Germans invited by the King betook themselves to England, among them Frederick Myconius. The foundation they took for the conversations they held with English theologians under Cranmer's presidency was the Augsburg Confession. Article after article of it they went through, endeavouring to make themselves clear with regard to all the thirteen. But, if the Germans hoped that upon this exposition England would move alongside, their delusion was soon apparent. Henry refused the thirteen. The King's closing years were definitely a time of [Roman] Catholic reaction. It was under his successor, Edward VI, who became king in 1547, that the English Reformation first actually received evangelical content."[1]

[1] Work cited, pp. 56–59.

Chapter XI.

THE TWO EDITIONS OF THE PRAYER-BOOK

The first edition, the Semi-Reform of 1549.
The second edition, the Change in 1552.
The new Light.
The reform adopted.
The account of the Institution.
The aim here accomplished.
The words of administration.
Reservation entirely abolished.

The First Edition: The Semi-Reform of 1549

Accordingly it was, with the disappearance of the old anti-Lutheran king and the strong influences round him that were suspicious of the Reformation, and the coming to the throne of the boy-King who grew up strong in intellect and ardently Protestant, although weak in body, that the Reformers had their chance. The regents of the boy-King were eager Protestants, and the situation was much like that of Hilkiah, keen for reform in the kingdom of Judah of long ago, with the boy Josiah as his ward.

So at last a Book of Common Prayer for the Church of England was published. That itself was a great and bold undertaking, which our familiarity with has robbed of its significance. That there was to be one use was not of so much value as that this new venture of a book of prayer for all was to be in English, the people's tongue. The dissemination of the Bible in English had no doubt paved the way.

But was the book to be Protestant? Certainly; but how far? That was the difficulty. The attachment to the old order was still strong.

So we can quite understand that the first edition of the Book of Common Prayer, which was in 1549, should fail to

reach the standard the reformers desired, and fail at the core, just where they must have felt the prayers most needed reform, for on that on which they had their eyes fixed, those in favour of the old way of thinking had their eyes fixed too, namely the Canon of the Holy Communion and its central thought, so far as man's apprehensions were concerned, the relation of the bread and wine to the sacred Presence.

So, when we open this first essay at reform, we find it carefully laid down that if there is an open communion on any day the priest is to reserve so much at the open communion as shall serve the sick person and his friends who have given notice, overnight or early that morning, of his desire to receive the Holy Communion in his house, but he is to "go and minister as soon as he may after the open Communion what has thus been reserved; and, if there be not an open Communion, a brief Celebration is to be held in the sick man's house, and should there yet be other sick persons to be served that day, sufficient of the bread and wine consecrated in the sick man's house shall be reserved at that Communion as shall serve those other sick persons and the friends who shall communicate with them; but here again the elements thus reserved shall be "immediately" carried away and administered. We notice then that continuous Reservation, with the idea it bore of a perpetual presence in the consecrated elements, is forbidden. But only so far the reformers ventured to check the old practice. Indeed, we find here Reservation for immediate transportation enjoined. Yet the narrowing down of the practice is to be observed.

It is when we come to the Canon that we find the reformers brought to a halt. They frame their exordium indeed in words inspired by the new spirit of the time, directed to the Heavenly Father, partly original, partly from the King's Book of 1543,[1] and partly from a moderate Catholic

[1] *A Necessary Doctrine and Erudition for any Christen Man, set furthe by the Kynges Majestie of Englande,* with a Preface by the King and commonly known as "the King's Book." (See F. E. Brightman, *The English Rite,* Vol. I, p. lv.)

document published the year after abroad,[1] words so poignant and grand that he who utters them and they who listen to them, as the common appeal of priest and people to the throne of grace, can be filled only with a sense of utter unworthiness. Also, be it noted, the sacrifice upon the cross is designated as a "one oblation once offered."

On this addition of reforming origin and tone there follows the Invocation of the Holy Spirit put in, which, in so far as it was known to be taken from an Eastern source, we may regard as a recognition that there was a Church of Jerusalem, Alexandria and Antioch, with its own order and customs, as well as the Papal power of the West, and, in so far as it was a prayer to the Holy Spirit, a bringing of priest and people to appeal for that Influence from Heaven that drives away all materialism, and yet which, with its prayer to God's "holy spirit and word" to "sanctify" the material elements, introduced just that very error, the sanctification of matter, that lay at the root of what had so troubled the Church.

We accordingly cannot be surprised that, when we come to the decisive part of the Canon, the part affecting the character to be assumed by what are called God's "creatures of Bread and Wine," we find the old prayer retained which meant transubstantiation, the prayer which in its Latin is still the use in England of those who continue under the jurisdiction of Rome: "That they [Thy creatures of bread and wine] may be unto us the body and blood of Thy most dearly beloved Son Jesus Christ."[2]

[1] *The Anti-didagma,* "a moderate restatement of the traditional Catholic doctrine and practice," published by the Cathedral Chapter of Cologne in 1544 in answer to their Archbishop, Hermann von Wied's *Einfaltiger Bedenken,* a Lutheran Order of Church Services he had drawn up and published in 1543 to promote the reformation in Cologne. (See work cited, Vol. I, p. xlv.)

[2] In the Sarum use and the Roman Missal the Latin is the same: "Ut nobis corpus et sanguis fiat dilectissimi filii tui domini Iesu Christi."

The English in the Prayer-Book of 1549 is as above: "that they [that is 'the bread and wine'] may be unto us the body and blood of Thy most dearly beloved Son Jesus Christ."

The English alongside the Latin in the Roman Missal of to-day is "that it [that is 'this our offering'] may become for us the body and blood of Thy most beloved Son, our Lord Jesus Christ."

True, and to be noted, with regard to the Words of Administration to the communicant, the old forms are now not simply translated out of Latin into English, but assisted to their historic meaning by insertions adopted from the German reformers which we here put in italics: "The body of our Lord Jesus Christ *which was given for thee* preserve thy body and soul unto everlasting life: the blood of our Lord Jesus Christ *which was shed for thee* preserve thy body and soul unto everlasting life."[1]

We see that with these changes only the outer battlements of the Central Prayer of the Holy Communion and, besides these, the Words of Administration were framed as the reformers desired. The fortress itself within the battlements with its perverted view of the nature of the consecrated bread and wine, and the relation of these to the heavenly Gift was left undisturbed, just as it was. The old flag was still flying. It was evident that at that the reformers could not stay. Further progress had to be made. A new edition had to be.

The Second Edition, the Change in 1552

When we open the pages of this new edition, which appeared in 1552, we find the reformation changes we have just recorded maintained, and further progress effected. The old fortress is gone, and the Invocation as well, which the reformers themselves had put in but which was really a buttress to it.

But what was to take the place of the transubstantiation fortress and its buttress? Was anything? That was the question that now faced the reformers.

At first sight we think why should they not have endorsed the Lutheran formula, and have put in a petition that "in and under" the form of the bread and wine the blessed Body and Blood might be given. But when we remember the antipathy of the late King who had passed away only five years previously, in 1547, and of certain leading English authorities under him, against Luther, an antipathy most

[1] These changes of the new use from the old are clearly shown in parallels drawn by F. E. Brightman in his *English Rite*.

definitely, on the King's part at least, against Luther's view of the Sacraments; also that Luther himself had, the year before Henry VIII's death, been taken to his rest; also that the Council of Trent had already begun its long session (1545–1563), summoned by the Pope to contravert Luther and all other heretics, while the political Peace of Augsburg, which allocated the Lutherans on the one hand and those who clung to "the old religion" on the other to different provinces (*cujus regio, ejus religio*) had, being arrived at only in 1555, not yet taken place, we can understand our reformers not setting up a Lutheran formula in place of the old. But chiefly of course their reason for not doing so would be that, as we have said, Luther had climbed only half-way down the mediaeval metaphysical ladder. If he had left the top rung, Transubstantiation, he had halted, with his "in and under" the elements, where Lanfranc of old time stood, the doctrine named by his followers Consubstantiation. Our reformers had come to see the advisability of coming down from the aerial ladder altogether to the safe green sward of real earth and, as they maintained, true heaven as well.

The New Light

For a view of safe landing had been, in the providence of God, afforded them. That was an important feature of the outlook. Luther we saw had clung half-way down the ladder because he saw no landing. If the gifts of the sacrament, the precious body broken and the blood that was shed, were not in the bread and wine of the sacrament, they were for him not in the Sacrament at all, and the penitent's sins, so far as the Sacrament went, were yet unforgiven. But the English reformers had taken into their mind the further view which the steadily progressive young Frenchman of the next generation to Luther, keen in intellect, diligent in his studies, deep-hearted, observant of the movement of thought that was going on, beginning indeed with Luther, and watched, as we have mentioned, by the veteran reformer with interest and at least with no

expressed disapproval, but going beyond him, had arrived at. For Calvin, as we have seen, the Body and Blood of Christ were in the heart of the faithful receiver. The metaphysical ladder was needed no longer.

The Reform Adopted

So, in this new edition of theirs, of 1552, the English reformers first withdrew the buttress they had attached to the old central fortress, that is to say the Invocation to God's Holy Spirit to sanctify the bread and wine. Whatever might be said as to the character of such a petition, it moved outside the region within which they believed the precious gift of the Body and Blood of the Lord was bestowed. The gift thereof was from God, who is spirit, into the believer's heart, whatever might be said by those who speculated as to what happened to the materials employed. As to the materials, whatever else might be said about them, they were God's "creatures," His created things, "of bread and wine," as they had already expressed in the opening words they had given to the Canon, and when the Lord gave His spiritual gifts He gave these to be eaten and drunk.

So they threw off the said strange appeal: "With Thy holy spirit . . . sanctify these Thy gifts and creatures of bread and wine," and appointed instead "Grant that we, receiving these Thy creatures of bread and wine according to Thy Son our Saviour Jesus Christ's holy institution, in remembrance of His death and passion, may be partakers of His most blessed body and blood."

They made manifest thus their acceptance of Calvin's discovery: That the Body and Blood of the Lord should be found in the heart of the faithful receiver.

The Account of the Institution

That tremendous petition composed, they left the remainder of the Canon as it had been in their previous (1549) English translation, the account as it was of the Institution of the Sacrament by the Lord as it was received from the Lord by St. Paul.

The Aim here Accomplished

Thus the reformers attained their goal. They had established in the Canon or Rule of the service what they had learned, and they had removed what they were convinced were long-inherited blemishes.

The Words of Administration

So anxious indeed were they to bear up the standard that, when in their revisal they passed on from the Canon or Rule to consider the Words used when Administering the elements, they, moved by fear lest the material elements should be confused after all with the spiritual gifts, withdrew the old Roman forms they had retained in 1549, and placed in their stead, at the dispensing of the bread, simply: "Take and eat this in remembrance that Christ died for thee, and feed on Him in thy heart by faith with thanksgiving"; and at the dispensing of the wine, simply "Drink this in remembrance that Christ's blood was shed for thee and be thankful."

Happily when, after the reversionary interval of Mary Tudor's reign, the use of 1552 with its Act of Uniformity was reinstated in 1559, a Protestant sovereign having again come to the throne, the administrative words taken over from the old Roman use, and explained, in 1549, were prefixed to these expressions that had been introduced in 1552.

Reservation Entirely Abolished

With regard to Reservation, the limiting injunctions in the Prayerbook of 1549 were omitted in the edition of 1552. In the 42 Articles of 1553 appeared these two statements: in the 26th Article, "The Sacraments were not ordained of Christ to be gazed upon or to be carried about; but that we should duly use them"; and in the 29th Article: "The Sacrament of the Lord's Supper was not by Christ's ordinance reserved, carried about, lifted up, or worshipped." These two articles became respectively the 25th and 28th of

the present 39 Articles of 1571. The rubric of 1552 had given over to the Curate for his own use the bread and wine that remained over after a Celebration. The rubric of 1661 limited what he might have to the unconsecrated bread and wine, and stated that "if any remain of that which was consecrated, it shall not be carried out of the church, but the priest and such other of the communicants as he shall then call unto him, shall, immediately after the blessing, reverently eat and drink the same."

Thus the Church set her face from 1552 onwards with ever increasing preciseness against any reservation whatsoever.

Chapter XII.

THE EXPLOSIVE ALREADY LAID

Recapitulation.
The Explosive.
The Opening Statement of the Charge.
The Gift given in the Eucharist given in other ways.
But this bestowal of the Gift in other ways does not mean denial of its reality in the Eucharist.
But when is the gift bestowed?
Hooker's view.
Yet the Lutheran view allowable in the Church of England.
Yet in criticism the Moment of Consubstantiation according to Luther is to be remembered.
The Doctrine of Transubstantiation.
Criticism of the Doctrine.
The Judgment of the Committee of the Privy Council on which the Archbishop based his declaration of the permissibility of the doctrine of Consubstantiation to be held and taught in the Church of England.

Recapitulation

Such then the point at which the Lutherans halted, and such the further advance of the Church of England, and such the stand of Westcott with both Canterbury and York to support him.

The Explosive

Yet, already, two years before that stand by Westcott and the support, such as it was, of the two primatial sees, that of All England and that of England, which was then given, there had been by the see of All England an explosive laid which undermined Westcott's protest and invalidated the support given to it, namely, a certain declaration made at his First Visitation, in 1898,[1] by Frederick Temple of Canterbury, upholding as permissible in the Church of England what he calls the Lutheran view of the sacred elements, which unguarded as we see

[1] Charge delivered at his first visitation, by Frederick, Archbishop of Canterbury, Macmillan & Co., 1898.

Luther guarded his view, gave the sanction for the very practice to which Westcott objected.

The Opening Statement of the Charge

The famous Charge began with a general statement of the Doctrine of the Eucharist held by the Church.

"There are," said the Archbishop, "certain matters concerning which there is some dispute amongst us, but no other which stirs men's minds so deeply, or which at the present moment is causing so much unrest as the doctrine of the Holy Eucharist. Now concerning that there are two distinct opinions which have for a long time divided Christians from one another. There are those who hold that no special gift is bestowed in the Sacrament, but that the value of it, mainly, if not entirely, resides in the effect produced on the soul of the receiver by the commemoration of that wonderful act of love—our Lord's sacrifice of Himself on the Cross. Nothing more, they think, is needed, and nothing more, they think, is given. The spiritual effect, according to this view, is great. The memory of the Cross works on all the being; it softens, purifies, elevates, kindles, and this to such a degree that possibly no other influence can be compared with that which is exercised through this great sacrifice. But there is no special gift, no supernatural interposition, any more than in prayer. The Sacrament, in fact, differs from prayer in degree, but not in kind.

"On the other hand, there are, and always have been, those who believe that this Sacrament conveys to the receivers a special mysterious gift, uniting us to Christ in a special manner and degree, giving new power, new cleansing, new life, and even new insight into spiritual things, leavening the whole being with a heavenly infection. This gift is something far beyond the natural working of our own minds. We cannot define it. It belongs to the same order as the things expressed by the familiar but mysterious phrases, "The Communion of Saints," "The Indwelling of Christ," "The Church, the Lord's Body," and the like.

The bread and the wine are no doubt figures, but they are figures which imply realities. Now, between these two opinions there can be no question at all that the Church holds the latter. The inward part of the Sacrament is declared in the Catechism to be the Body and Blood of Christ, which are verily and indeed taken and received by the faithful in the Lord's Supper. The Communicants are told in the Communion Office that if, with a true penitent heart and lively faith, we receive that holy Sacrament, then we spiritually eat the Flesh of Christ and spiritually drink His Blood, we are one with Christ and Christ with us. And the teaching of the Articles is precisely the same; for there it is declared that to such as rightly, worthily, and with faith receive the same, the bread which we break is a partaking of the Body of Christ, and likewise the cup of blessing is a partaking of the Blood of Christ. It is true that the gift bestowed is a spiritual gift, given and taken and eaten in a spiritual manner, and the means by which the Body of Christ is received and eaten in faith. But this only declares in a certain measure the nature of the gift, and does not in the slightest degree touch on its reality. And the language used in the Catechism, in the Communion Office, and in the Articles would be impossible if we believed that no gift at all was given.

The Gift given in the Eucharist given in other ways

"It is true, again, that the Church acknowledges that the gift may be, and sometimes is, given without the Sacrament to which it properly belongs, for, though the gift be promised with the Sacrament, it is no departure from that promise if it shall please God to dispense with His own ordinance, and give the same gift in other ways and on other occasions. The Church of Christ has always held that, if the Sacrament, for just reasons, cannot be had, the Christian who desires it will not be deprived of his heart's desire, or of the supreme blessing attached to his membership in Christ, by what is no fault of his own. He will receive the same gift in answer to his repentance and prayer and thanksgiving as

if the consecrated elements were given to him in Church by the priest appointed to give them.

But this Bestowal of the Gift in other ways does not mean denial of its Reality in the Eucharist

"But this teaching, so plainly set forth in the third Rubric after the Office for the Communion of the Sick, only emphasises the reality of the gift, for unless the gift were a real thing this teaching would be altogether needless. It is hardly necessary to add that the doctrine of the reality of the gift bestowed in the Holy Communion is universal in the writings of the early Christians, and is still maintained not only by the Anglican Communion, but also by the Greek and other Churches in the East, by the Romans and by the Lutherans."

But when is the gift bestowed?

With this description of the doctrine of the Church all Churchmen would doubtless agree, but the Archbishop again spoke well when he proceeded to state that "having come to this point, we reach a further question and another division of opinion. For it may be asked," he said, "When is the gift bestowed, and how?"

As to when the gift was bestowed, the Archbishop said there was no doubt as to when it was bestowed upon the individual communicant. In fact, to that, "only one answer was possible." "It is bestowed," he said, "when he receives the consecrated elements. He cannot receive it before, for till that moment he has not fulfilled the necessary conditions; but the consuming of the bread and wine is the means whereby he receives the gift, and the pledge dispute upon this point. But if the question be, not to him that he has received it. Nor indeed is there any when does the communicant receive the gift, but when does the congregation in which the Holy Eucharist is celebrated receive it, not as individuals, but as a congregation, the answer may be very different, and on the answer to this question there have been the angriest and longest

controversies, and this is the dispute which is commonly called the 'dispute regarding the Real Presence.'"

Hooker's View

Happily, the Archbishop went on to say that the Church of England has given no answer to this question; and still more happily, as declaring what the Church of England does teach, he at once added, "and Hooker, undeniably a very high authority on the doctrine of the Church of England, maintains that the Real Presence should not be looked for in the consecrated elements but in the receivers. They certainly receive a real gift, and knowing this, why should we ask any further questions? Knowing the reality of the gift, we know all that is needed for our spiritual life. The Church certainly teaches Hooker's doctrine."

Yet the Lutheran view allowable in the Church of England

Then there came in the Charge immediately, with only a comma to divide it from what had just been uttered, as if there was no contradiction, the statement which we have called "an explosive already laid," calculated to undermine the protest which Westcott, it so happened, was to make two years later, and the support the Archbishop and his brother Archbishop then gave him. "But to this it must be added," the reader of the Charge continued, "that the Church nowhere forbids the further doctrine that there is a Real Presence in some way attached to the elements at the time of consecration and before the reception," and further, that a certain Mr. Bennett of Frome had asserted "The Real and actual Presence of our Lord under the form of bread and wine upon the altars of our churches," and had made the confession "Who myself adore and teach the people to adore Christ present in the Sacrament under the form of bread and wine, believing that under their veil is the sacred Body and Blood of my Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ." The doctrine had been so stated by Mr. Bennett, the Archbishop said, before the Privy Council, and when it

was thus expressed that Council had refused to condemn it. An earlier mode of statement by Mr. Bennett, in the first edition of his book,[1] of expressing his doctrine, the Archbishop subsequently informed his audience, had been not simply the "Real and actual Presence, but the visible Presence of the Lord on the altars of our churches": an assertion which reminds us of the visions which Paschasius Radbertus tells us about. But the term "visible" Mr. Bennett afterwards withdrew. On this the Archbishop made the comment, that "although the doctrine as Mr. Bennett eventually expressed it be not explicitly taught in our formularies, there is nothing in these formularies which explicitly forbids a man to hold or teach it." And finally he added, "It is difficult, if not impossible, really to distinguish between this doctrine and the Lutheran doctrine commonly called Consubstantiation, and (here his words are to be specially noted) it is important that it should be clearly understood that it is not unlawful to hold it and to teach it within the Church of England."

Yet in criticism the Moment of Consubstantiation according to Luther is to be remembered

Seeing that the Archbishop had said that a real presence as "in some way attached to the elements at the time of consecration and before the reception" was allowable to be held and taught in the Church of England, the reader will recognise, when he listens to the Archbishop's comparison of the same with the Lutheran doctrine, the importance of remembering what we have already stated, that Luther and his followers after him held that the consubstantiation does not take place until the bread and wine are received by the communicant, and only while they are received; thus, whatever we may say as to the accordance of this restriction with Luther's mode of understanding the Lord's words, all claim is cut off for the advent of the Lord's body and blood into the bread and wine at the repetition of the Lord's

[1] A Plea for Toleration in the Church of England, in a letter to the Rev. E. B. Pusey, London, 1867.

words by the priest, and all claim for the presence of these in such of the bread and wine as is not bestowed, thus cutting off all reason for Reservation.

The Doctrine of Transubstantiation

The Archbishop next occupied his charge with denunciation of the doctrine of Transubstantiation, the fullest exposition of which was found, he said, in the "Summa Theologica" of Thomas Aquinas. "According to that doctrine," he said, "the substance of the bread and wine was by the prayer of consecration miraculously converted into the Body and Blood of our Lord, while the accidents, as the schoolmen called them, that is, the size, shape, colour, feel, taste, smell, weight, of the bread remained the same." It was here he took occasion to mention what we have already noted him mentioning, that Mr. Bennett in the first edition of his book went indeed further than this, implying in that addition that the accident of visibility at all events was attached to the substance of the Lord's body, asserting as he did the visible not simply substantial presence of the Lord on the altars of our churches. "The Romans never teach," he said, "that the Body of the Lord, when present on the altar, is visibly present, or that any of these so-called accidents are accidents of the Lord's body. This is held by Aquinas as inconsistent with the doctrine of our Lord's divinity. Aquinas laid down that to say that the size, shape, colour, feel, taste, smell, weight are now the size, shape, colour, feel, taste, smell, weight of the Lord's body is not permitted, and, if we ask of what thing then are these accidents, the answer is they are accidents of nothing. They have no substance. They are appearances and they are nothing more."

Criticism of the Doctrine of Transubstantiation

The Archbishop then criticised that doctrine. "Most assuredly," he exclaimed, "if ever human inventions have been allowed to supersede the teaching of Scripture, this is among the number of such inventions. There is not a

word in the New Testament which can be wrested into a support for the doctrines of the substance of the bread into the Body of the Lord, or of the substance of the wine into His blood; and the prayer in some of the early liturgies beseeching the Holy Ghost to make the bread and wine into the Body and Blood of the Lord for us is an absurdly weak foundation for this highly metaphysical structure of a change of the substance without disturbing the accidents and the maintenance of the accidents as accidents of nothing."

"The Church of England," he said, "has condemned this teaching as unscriptural, as inconsistent with the very nature of a Sacrament (since a Sacrament implies an external visible sign with an inward and spiritual grace), as tending and having already given rise to many superstitions."

The Lutheran Doctrine

Then the Archbishop referred to his former statement, putting the matter however a little more cautiously. "The Church of England," he said, "permits—it cannot be said that it anywhere teaches, but it permits— the teaching of what it is hard to distinguish from the Lutheran doctrine, but there it stops, and no man is allowed to teach anything that goes beyond that."

Then he noted a change of mind in the church. "Fifty years ago," he said, "a great body of the clergy in this country certainly held, as far as they ever defined the matter to themselves, the doctrine of Hooker: but I do not think we can quite say the same now. There are a good many who have since adopted the doctrine of Luther instead, although I do not think they often speak of it—I do not know that I ever even heard them speak of it—as Lutheran. But it is important in time of dispute that we should clearly understand that the Church has not forbidden that doctrine, and that the Supreme Court of Appeal in matters ecclesiastical has so declared that this is open to all to believe if they think fit."

Chapter XIII.

THE BENNETT JUDGMENT

Mr. Bennett's statements.
The View the Judicial Committee took of its task.
What the Committee found to be the teaching of the Church of England.
The charge against the accused not sufficiently clear for penal proceedings.
The criticism of the Royal Commission of 1904–6 of the Deduction sometimes drawn from the Bennett Judgment.

The Importance of the Judgment

Seeing that it was on the Judgment with regard to Mr. Bennett made in 1872 by the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council,[1] "the Supreme Court," as he calls it, "in matters ecclesiastical" that the Archbishop based his declaration that the doctrine of Consubstantiation, or something indistinguishable from it, might be held and taught in the Church of England,[2] it is due and important to review that Judgment, endeavouring to find out what the Committee said regarding Mr. Bennett's successive statements, the view they took of their duty, what they believed they discovered the true teaching of the Church of England on the question to be, and why, although the first-hand meaning of Mr. Bennett's final declaration was contrary to

[1] *Sheppard* v. *Bennett*, being the Judgment of the Lords of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, 8th June, 1872.

[2] Chapter XII, pp. 88 and 90.

what they understood the teaching of the Church of England to be, they gave him the benefit of another interpretation.

Mr. Bennett's Statements

First, Mr. Bennett's statements. There were four: First the statement he made in the first edition of his book quoted by the Archbishop, in which Mr. Bennett spoke of "the real actual and visible presence of our Lord upon the altars of our churches." There was, next, the statement in the second edition with the word "visible" dropped out and "under the form of bread and wine" inserted after the word "Lord." There was thirdly the longer statement in both these editions: "Who myself adore and teach the people to adore the consecrated elements, believing Christ to be in them—believing that under their veil is the sacred Body and Blood of my Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ." Then there came the statement which the archbishop quotes, which Mr. Bennett substituted for that just given, and which in the opinion of the majority of the Privy Council Committee did not make out the charge against the writer as clearly as the rules that governed penal proceedings required: "Who myself adore and teach the people to adore Christ present in the Sacrament under the form of Bread and Wine, believing that under their veil is the sacred Body and Blood of my Lord Saviour Jesus Christ."

It will be observed that in the last, the allowed, form of the statement, the words "consecrated elements" are replaced by the ambiguous word "Sacrament," for that word has two meanings, namely, the ordinance as a whole or the material elements used in the ordinance. It was the substitution of this word with its possible, indeed usual and proper, meaning of the ordinance as a whole that enabled the acquittal of the appellant, for the Committee, after, giving the above enumeration of his statements, go on to lay down that the doctrine that "adoration is due to the consecrated elements" is "contrary to law and must be condemned."[1]

[1] *The Judgment*, p. 20.

The View the Judicial Committee took of its Task

Next, as to the view the Committee took of their task. They insist that, as in Gorham's case, so the question for them to decide is not whether the opinions brought before them are "theologically sound or unsound," but whether these opinions are "contrary or repugnant to the doctrines which the Church of England by its articles, formularies and rubrics requires to be held by its ministers, so that upon the ground of those opinions the appellant can lawfully be excluded from his benefice," and that they have "no jurisdiction or authority to settle matters of faith," and that, "as in the case of King's Proctor v. Stone, if any article is really a subject of dubious interpretation it would be highly improper for the Court to fix on one meaning and prosecute all those who hold a contrary opinion, but that it was a very different thing should the authority of the articles be totally eluded, and the party deliberately declare his intention of teaching doctrines contrary to them."[1]

What the Committee found to be the Teaching of The Church of England

As to their view of the teaching of the Church of England the Committee, after referring to the formularies involved, gave this as their judgment: "It follows that the Church of England has forbidden all acts of adoration to the Sacrament, understanding by that the consecrated elements. She has been careful to exclude any act of adoration on the part of the minister at or after the act of consecration." And then they stated the consideration which enabled them to release the accused. "Some of their Lordships [i.e. of the members of the Committee] have doubt whether the word 'adore' [used in the above quoted final statement of Mr. Bennett], though it seems to point rather to acts of worship such as are forbidden by the 28th Article, may not be construed to refer to mental adoration in prayers ad-

[1] *The Judgment*, p. 10.

dressed to Christ present spiritually in the Sacrament, which does not necessarily imply any adoration of the consecrated elements or of any corporal or natural presence therein."[1]

The Charge against the Accused not sufficiently clear for Penal Proceedings

This then was the form the sentence upon the appellant took: "Upon the whole their Lordships, not without doubts and divisions of opinions, have come to the conclusion that this charge [against the appellant] is not so clearly made out as the rules which govern penal proceedings require. Mr. Bennett is entitled to the benefit of any doubt that may exist. His language has been rash, but, as it appears to the majority of their Lordships that his words can be construed so as not to be plainly repugnant to the two passages articled against them, their Lordships will give him the benefit of the doubt that has been raised."[1]

The Criticism of the Royal Commission of 1904–6 of the Deduction sometimes drawn from the Bennett Judgment

When we recollect that the Archbishop after declaring the doctrine of the Church as to the reality of the gift bestowed in the Holy Communion, and that one who was "undeniably a very high authority," namely Hooker, had maintained that "the Real Presence should not be looked for in the consecrated elements but in the receiver," went on to say "it must be added that the Church nowhere forbids that there is a Real Presence in some way attached to the elements at the time of consecration and before the reception," and proceeded to quote Mr. Bennett's revised assertion that he adored Christ present in the Sacrament in the form of bread and wine, and brought forward to establish his contention the refusal of the Privy Council Committee, "the Supreme Court," as he reminded his hearers, "in matters

[1] *The Judgment*, p. 22.

ecclesiastical," to condemn Mr. Bennett's statement, we can quite understand the criticism of the Royal Commission of 1904–6: "The real relation of the judgment [in the case of Sheppard v. Bennett] to Mr. Bennett's teaching has been frequently misunderstood. His language has been taken in the sense which the Court held that it narrowly avoided; and his acquittal has been treated as establishing the legality of doctrine which his language was held not to express."[1]

[1] "Report of the Royal Commission on Ecclesiastical Discipline," 1904–6, section 82, p. 16.

Chapter XIV.

A DEEPER LOOK INTO JUSTIN

FRESH INSPECTION OF THE USE NEEDED.
THE MEDIUM OF COLOUR.
REPLIES TO OUR QUESTIONS.
THE INFLUENCE OF LIGHTFOOT.
WESTCOTT'S AWARENESS.
THE POSITION OF LIGHTFOOT.
THE ONE AIM: A TRUE PICTURE.
THE BIAS CAUSED BY THE PRESENT REQUEST.
THE WISDOM OF THE REFORMERS.
WESTCOTT AND THE PRAYER-BOOK.
THE MEANING OF THE PICTURE.
THE EXPLANATION GIVEN BY JUSTIN.
THE EXPLANATION EXAMINED.
HOW DID THIS ESCAPE WESTCOTT?

THE reader will now feel that what is needed is a deeper look into Justin.

THE MEDIUM OF COLOUR

It will also have crossed his mind that our mountain-dweller may have been viewing the landscape through the brightness that lay round his station. Westcott was assiduous in gathering facts, careful in thinking out his principles, cautious in making deductions, if he did make deductions, for he showed men the good example of waiting confessedly not knowing rather than announcing a half-thought-out conclusion, although when his mind was made up none were more tenacious than he to keep to what he discovered. Yet, dweller as he was in that bright world of the Phaedo, where the ideals so imperfectly reflected in the lower sphere are seen in their native reality, he was inclined as he looked down to fancy he saw glories below

which were really above: not that he was not aware how generally disappointing to the idealist the world below experientially is.

So perhaps we may see, or may fancy we see, Westcott's view coloured by his own imagination when we note his admiration of Justin, the attraction we spoke of Greek for him and his company, the general expectation of finding genuine Christian life that one would naturally entertain in approaching a Christian service in the Church's morning.

And perhaps too we may ask whether the spectacle of the earnest young spirits round him eager for the adoption of this use did not awaken in him a fatherly desire to please them: or indeed whether the convenience and simplicity and avoidance of unseemly surroundings that the use enabled did not make against what a wiser judgment would have esteemed it to be.

Finally, it may occur to us that perhaps the vision these beginners in their ministry brought before him of an English congregation in their parish church with some sick person close by shut off from communion, came first in his mind, and made up a frame he fitted on to the scene which Justin describes, which when looked at within that frame assumed an aspect that seemed to him satisfactory.

Replies to our Questions

The writer believes that his master withstood all these allurements except perhaps two.

That Westcott was not here carried away by Justin Martyr may be inferred from his pointing out, in the course of the special lectures we alluded to, given to extra-keen voluntary students at Cambridge,[1] not only what he calls the "unique" insight betimes of that Church father, but that he could also adopt popular but erroneous belief.[2] That he was not led astray in his enthusiasm for Greek, even for Plato, is shown by his sharp rebuke of St. Augustine and "the Areopagite" for what he calls their "Platonism,"

[1] Chap. IV, p. 19.

[2] *Gospel of Life*, p. 116.

by which he meant their belief that matter was in itself evil. That he would be induced to meeting anyone's even best-intended desires by consenting to what he esteemed unwise is unthinkable. Nor can we agree that convenience or seemliness of circumstances would have had any weight with him in comparison with the securing of the proper spiritual atmosphere for the receiving.

But where we venture to question our revered and beloved master—and we know that, had he been still in this mortal life, he would have been willing to listen to us—is with regard to, first, his estimate of the general character of early Church thought; and, secondly, his suffering his view of Justin to be influenced by the special call for decision which was at the moment brought before him.

The Influence of Lightfoot

First, then, to consider Westcott's estimate of early Church thought.

We have already mentioned the attractiveness of beginnings as influencing the Bishop and his company. We may perhaps say that all great movements begin well, and usually begin strongly. Such at all events we know was the case with the early Church. It is this pristine impulse and its subsequent current that draws our attention and rightly, for that is the vital force that makes the movement exist. But we forget the impurities that perhaps have always, as some people hold, been in every vivifying current of human endeavour, even at the source thereof. And this forgetfulness of impurities seems to be natural to one who is himself in a great movement, and looks up to the head of the stream: naturally especially to one in that great supernatural movement which constitutes the Church of Christ. What may we not believe of the times of a breaking forth of the life of the Spirit?

But there was, as we have already indicated, a special reason for Westcott's enthusiasm, somewhat obscuring the shadows he might have seen in the mind and practice of the early Church: the influence of his favourite pupil Joseph

Barber Lightfoot, his "fidus Achates" in Cambridge days until Lightfoot became Bishop of Durham, and then, when he himself became his successor, than whom he acknowledged, as we have recorded, none to be nearer in spirit. We are to realise then that Lightfoot by his presentations of early Church history, so virile and spiritually attractive, made the Church of his day, and especially the Church in Durham, enthusiastic believers in the purity of the Church's beginning. We should say the Church's "beginnings." For not only the great apostle of the Gentiles and his converts and the earliest fathers of the Church, but the first apostles of Christ in the North of England assumed, through the writings of Lightfoot, an actuality in the Church's mind as never before. It was not without justice then that Lightfoot's own motto, "History is a cordial for drooping spirits," became associated in the public mind with these literary labours of his, and the cordial the writer offered, be it noted, was a draught of the freshness of the morning. So, if Westcott and Hort were the textual critics of the Cambridge School of their day, and the teachers of ideas and principles for everyday practice, Lightfoot was the inspiring biographer and presenter of the Church's pioneer movements. No wonder then, with Lightfoot always so close to him, possessing an influence superior to withdrawal from mortal sight, that Westcott should have had a bias, or shall we call it rather a "reflexion of his friend's roseate view"?

Westcott's Awareness

Not that we may not believe that Westcott did not know much more than he spoke about, or than people gave him credit for knowing. His wish to discover adequately, before he spoke, kept him silent. His diffidence and confession of ignorance, to which Canon Scott Holland alludes in a contribution to his son Arthur's account of his life, put many a man to shame.[1] Not infrequently, to the discomforture of the over-confident, he was found to know much more than was expected. No doubt he was often

[1] *Life*, I, p. 311.

silent for charity or loyalty's sake. He was slow, as we have seen, to accuse.

So, in our estimate of his knowledge of the abuses we have detailed, we have to beware of thinking he knew not what he was, to his sorrow, probably only too well aware of.

We find him thus writing to a clergyman, 15th May, 1901, not long after the very question we have been discussing in this essay had been brought so prominently into public notice: "Surely the 'reserved Sacrament' in a secret Chapel for private purposes is as sad as some of the uses of the consecrated elements quoted from early writers. Can it be Christian in conception?"[1]

The Position of Lightfoot

We are to remember that Lightfoot, kindled by the interest in "the great Church" that had awakened shortly before his time, was a pioneer tracing the dominant lines of the Church's progress, which are lines of light. He did not ignore the shadows, but historians since his time have been making a wider and deeper survey. It is possible that their attention to the shadows has led them to see on their part the picture to be darker than it really is. And that warning is to be taken indeed to ourselves who have passed in review these strange doings in connexion with the Holy Eucharist. We are to remember that what Westcott called "the great things of our faith" were also present, still held, impelling in one direction and another to clearer and truer views, although in one direction and another their purifying and corrective power was not allowed to act.

The One Aim: a True Picture

It is not for any of us, however, to ignore what has been discovered as to the shadows. The first desire of each of us will be to have the true picture before us. Then we shall have a basis on which to judge and from which to learn.

[1] *Life*, I., p. 356.

The Bias occasioned by the Present Request

Secondly, there is no doubt that Westcott allowed the terms of the request put to him to influence his view of Justin.

Only thus can we explain his surprise that Mr. Hansell, pleading at the Hearing at Lambeth in 1899 for Reservation, should have thought that Westcott had authorised Reservation in certain cases.[1] Mr. Hansell would of course, knowing that Westcott had authorised in some way Justin's use, have made himself acquainted with that use, and it is evident from his speech that he took it that Justin's use did involve Reservation. Having made that discovery, he inferred that Westcott had allowed it, and hailed him as an approver. At Mr. Hansell's claiming him Westcott was surprised because, as we can see when we survey the use for ourselves, he was looking at the use through the limits of the request put before him as one—so we have already put it—looks at a wide picture through a narrow frame. The request was whether he would allow administration to the sick, and apparently definitely the sick close by. That is how Archbishop Frederick Temple described Westcott's method in his Opinion,[2] and that is how we ourselves recollect it. In that Westcott saw a practically synchronous and co-local administration and, if the sick were made duly acquainted with the Canon, the spiritual awareness also presumably secured. Within this outline, which gave him all he required, he saw Justin's bright picture of the Church's early days gleaming, and so claimed Justin as an ancient and much reverenced authority for his permitting what was besought. But the frame narrowed the width of the picture. There are no restrictions in Justin's use. The material elements are sent to the absentees as such, no condition of theirs of awareness of what the ministration to them should mean is mentioned, no limit to the distance to which the elements may be taken, or how they may be conveyed.

[1] Letter of 18 July, 1899, given in Chapter VII, p. 46.
[2] Chapter VIII, pp. 52–3.

And, when we consider this attractive frame—the administering to the faithful and aware sick man close by—we see that it not only narrowed for those who looked through it Justin's bright picture, but actually by its own radiance (not only for Westcott but for the two Archbishops also, when they gave their Opinion, these latter two perhaps desiring to say well of the plan as much from a personal liking for it as from a wish to support Westcott, if they could) obscured its defects. Only because of that obscuring can we understand how Westcott should not have seen at once that the emphasis on the material to which he so much objected was plainly there; and how the Archbishop of Canterbury, having begun by defining Reservation as a reserving of a portion of the consecrated bread and wine, and administering it to those not present in church when the Prayer of Consecration had been said, and having mentioned three forms of the practice as commonly spoken of as Reservation, giving Westcott's plan as the first of three, thus indeed enrolling it under the category of Reservation in common regard, should have given the unsatisfactory excuse, that that plan could not be called Reservation, because the elements were taken out of Church to those who were close by at the time of administration, and so it could not be said that what was sent in that way was a part of what remained after the service was over.[1]

The Wisdom of the Reformers

When we consider these difficulties of squaring this so diminished use with avoidance of what Westcott so much objected to, we see the wisdom of our reformers from 1552 to 1661 making more and more sure with increasing exactitude that the consecrated bread and wine was not to be taken out of the Church at all.

Westcott and the Prayer-Book

One feels astonishment that Westcott here did not keep to the Prayer-book. All through his ministration in his

[1] Chapter VIII, p. 53.

diocese he was particularly careful to enjoin obedience, both as to the liberty he found given in the book and as to its restrictions.

But there again we can only suppose that the attractiveness of his plan made him slow to see its defects. That at last he was troubled over the permission here granted, seems possible to the disciple who writes. At a meeting, when a few were gathered round him and the problems besetting the Church came to be discussed, he entreated, with a manifest earnestness that indicated how vital he felt his advice to be, that the Church would keep to the Prayer-book—one of his last entreaties.

On the 27th July, 1901, after a few days' illness that gave him much pain and discomfort, "the good Bishop entered into his rest," as his son Arthur in his *Life* of his father expresses it, at the age of 76, peacefully in his sleep.[1]

The Meaning of the Picture

Let us now, the special modification which Westcott made of it laid aside, inspect Justin's view for ourselves, and try to understand better what the transaction portrayed really is as we watch it going on, and, what is more important still, what the writer holds is the meaning attached to it.

We have already indicated what the picture is, as we look at it as simply an external happening: a sending from the feast of the bread and wine, over which thanks have been given, to all who were absent from the general partaking, wherever they might be. There we have Westcott's "coincidence," albeit time and place and the sending make it to be not literal. And we cannot say that we have none of the spiritual atmosphere he desired when the administration to the absent should take place. The deacons we may assume to be of clerical rank. We notice that, although it was the president who gave thanks, it was the deacons who gave the bread and wine to the communicants, so they were as the clergy in the parish church who had given the bread

[1] *Life*, II, p. 401.

and wine at the altar-rails, one of whom was sent out into the parish as they into the city to continue the distribution. Thus was it, to put it into modern aspect, one of the officiating clergy who appeared before the absentee communicant, bringing with him that over which thanks had been given at the feast. How the deacon secured that he to whom he ministered should be as aware as the communicant in general gathering was, of what the dispensing to him signified, we know not. It is for us to recognise that in these early days services had not reached the orderliness that experience gradually taught the authorities was required. But it is for us to suppose that the tone and meaning of his act in the assembly the deacon would do his best to bring with him when he ministered to the isolated member. On these suppositions Westcott is met, but even these suppositions fall short of what he required.

The Explanation given by Justin

But it is of course our first duty to find out what the writer, writing his defence to the Emperor, believed the bread and wine of the ceremony to be held to be by Christians of his day. We have it told quite clearly in a passage between his two accounts of the Eucharist.

"And this food is called by us Eucharist, and it is not lawful for any man to partake of it but he who believes our teaching to be true, and has been washed with the washing which is for the forgiveness of sins and unto a new birth, and is so living as Christ commanded. For not as common bread and common drink do we receive these; but, like as Jesus Christ our Saviour being made flesh through the word of God took both flesh and blood for our salvation, so also were we taught that the food for which thanks are given by the word of prayer that comes from him—food by which our blood and flesh by conversion are nourished—is both flesh and blood of that Jesus who was made flesh.[1] For the Apostles in the memoirs which they composed, which

[1] "That Jesus who was made flesh," "ekeinou tou sarkopoiēthentos Iēsou."

are called Gospels, thus delivered that command was given them—that Jesus took bread and gave thanks and said, This do in remembrance of Me, this is My body; and that He likewise took the cup, and after He had given thanks said, This is My blood and gave of it only to them. Which the evil demons imitated commanding it to be done also in the mysteries of Mithras; for that bread and a cup of water are set forth with certain formulae in the ceremonial of initiation, you either know or can learn."[1]

The Explanation Examined

Now, as we consider this description, we are at first sight inclined to take it that the inaccuracy that seems well-nigh inevitable in certain cases with ourselves is present here also. Justin declares that "this food, this bread and wine" "is the Thanksgiving," the "Eucharist," whereas properly speaking, if we mean by "Thanksgiving" "object of thanksgiving," the Eucharist is the blessed Body and Blood of Christ, a spiritual entity, of which the bread and wine are only the material signs; and if we mean "thanksgiving" simply, the essential ceremony with its giving and receiving and Rule ("Canon" as we call it) is the Eucharist.[2] We remember our own similar inaccuracy in the use of the word "Sacrament," and are inclined to excuse our present writer.

Or we notice that the bread and wine are said to be received "not as common bread or as common wine" when they are taken in the Sacrament, and again we are inclined to excuse him. We ourselves speak of the Bible as a "holy book," and the church building as a "sacred building," and think that perhaps something like that, a being out of the ordinary, not as different in itself but as a thing not subject to the common use, is what the describer of the Christian mode of thought and practice here means.

[1] Justin, "Apol.," i. 66. Gwatkin's translation in *Selections from Early Christian Writers*, p. 53.

[2] The meaning of Eucharist when the ceremony is meant has been given thus: "The whole central action of the liturgy, whatever its scope in detail." See Hort, J. Th. St. iii 594 f. on use of the word.

But it is not for us to be thus misled. As we ponder the account we are struck with the carefulness of its language. We are to remember that the writer was addressing the Head of the Law, and would know that his words would be weighed and that no light consequences would follow the impression he made, be it for or against those for whom he made his defence.

We come to conclude indeed that in the accounts which Justin has given us of the Sacrament there is an accuracy of language wherewith he rebukes ourselves, habitually prone as we are to looseness of expression even when stringency is called for. We shall observe him describing the bread and wine and water of the Sacrament as "that for which thanks have been given" (eucharistēthenta). That of course is the correct expression. Our term "consecrated" is inaccurate, if we mean to use the term in its precise meaning. In what St. Paul received from the Lord, Jesus "gives thanks" (eucharistēsas[1]) before He breaks the bread. That is, he offers the thanksgiving to God for God's bounty of nature, which was the custom among the Jews before taking a meal. In the account of the transaction in the synoptic account in St. Matthew and St. Mark, we have the similar verb "He blessed" (eulogēsas[2]) (i.e. "blessed God") before the Lord breaks the bread, while "gives thanks" (eucharistēsas[3]) is the expression the Lord uses when He takes the cup. We are right indeed, considering conjointly the Lord's "blessing" of His Father for His bounty, and the use to which the Lord put the bread, to call the bread "consecrated"; but "consecrated" is not the term used by Justin. He here keeps strictly to the Scriptural account.

So we are not to treat Justin's phraseology lightly. We may well take him to mean no less than what he says. It is "this food," this material food so given, which for him is the "eucharist," and "this bread and this wine and

[1] 1 Cor. xi. 24.
[2] Matt. xxvi. 26; Mark xiv. 22.
[3] Matt. xxvi. 27; Mark xiv. 23.

water" so given which are literally "not common bread and not common drink." A change, whatever the change may be, has come over them.

As we read further we are certified as to this change and learn how great it is. We have the apologist's description, which must have already startled the reader, of what the bread and wine have actually become. Let us recall his words: "Not as common bread and common drink do we receive these; but [now we get the reason for and manner of this difference that has set in] like as Jesus Christ, our Saviour, being made flesh through the word of God took both flesh and blood for our salvation, so also were we taught that the food which was thanked for (eucharistētheisan) by the prayer-word from him (di' euchēs logou) . . . is both flesh and blood of that Jesus who was made flesh." Here we have a remarkable conception indeed of what the word was which came from Jesus before He broke the bread. We have just congratulated Justin on keeping us to the true meaning of that word by recurrently naming the material elements of the transaction as "the food over which thanks were given," but now we find him regarding that thanksgiving of Jesus to His heavenly Father for the bounty of the earth as a creative word, a creative logos, like the Word (Logos) of the Prelude of the Gospel according to St. John. As Jesus Himself became flesh and blood, that is became man, through the Word of God, so does this bread and wine become flesh and blood of Jesus by Jesus' word. Yet it is to be noticed that (as recognising the relation of the Son to the Father) this word of Jesus is in the same breath spoken of as a "prayer," a prayer (we infer) that this creative-power may be granted by His Father, the source of all creation from whom, as so wonderfully portrayed in the Fifth Chapter of St. John's Gospel, all the power of the Son directly or by delegation has its origin. Here then is the root of the altered conception which we have noticed, of the bread and wine. They have under this marvellous use of them become no longer what they were, because they have been lifted up into the

different category of a new creation, and the meaning of the thanksgiving for God's natural bounty has become a creative formula to suit the change of conception.

Struckmann, we note, thus understands Justin. He claims that these words of Justin, when fully explained, can only mean a "change of the being" of the bread and wine mixed with water. The doctrine of Transubstantiation, he admits, is not expressly stated, but he is certain it is implied.

Justin, we may have noticed, does in his account mention a change, a "conversion" as Professor Gwatkin's translation which we have quoted renders the word "metabolē," but the change thus verbally described is a change not of the bread and wine but of the flesh and blood of the communicants, by which Struckmann holds Justin probably means the change in their bodies for the future immortality.[1]

We get a side indication that a change in the material of the Sacrament is thus meant by Justin, and also a hint that such a thoughtful mind as his was most likely suspicious that all was not well with such teaching, when he goes on to speak of the evil demons "imitating" this converting of material, "commanding it to be done also" in the mysteries of Mithras.

It does not seem to be quite clear to what in the Mithras mysteries Justin here alludes. A relief has been found at Konjica in Bosnia, carved on the reverse of a slab on which Mithras the bull-slayer is represented. The relief presents figures and in their midst a table with four loaves, and these four loaves are marked with a cross. Two of the figures are disguised as animals, another as a Persian. This is thought to be an illustration of Porphyry's information, in which he tells us that the leo (one of these figures wears a lion's mask) had both hands and tongue purified with honey.[2] There we have a transmission of power through matter, which is the mode of transmission Justin has been describing, and the crosses help us to think that it was from Christians in this case the notion of the purifying honey was derived.

[1] Adolf Struckmann, *Die Gegenwart Christi in der hl. Eucharistie*.

[2] *Encycl. Rel. and Ethics*, art. "Mithraism," p. 756.

We know indeed very definitely that among Gnostic Christians, whom the Church was not long shaking off as heretics, the effecting of a change in matter by consecration was taught. Clement of Alexandria, the second master in succession of the Alexandrian school of theology, who probably wrote in the reign of the emperor Septimius Severus (193–211),[1] tells us out of the writings of a certain Theodotus—whom Struckmann thinks to be probably an adherent of the Valentinian Gnosis—that when the bread (of the Eucharist) the oil (of Confirmation) the water (of Baptism) were consecrated "by the power of the Name" [that is probably "by the Name of Christ"] they remained not what they externally seemed to be when they were taken for customary use, but by power into spiritual power were changed."[2]

How did this escape Westcott?

How was it that the import of this escaped Westcott? for we cannot think of him putting the parochial frame on the picture if had he realised that this was the meaning of Justin, if one only rested awhile before the apologist's account, and let its proper impression sink in.

Our answer is, as we have said, that his were the days of what we may call a first survey of Church history and doctrine. We have searched further, found more, and looked deeper since then.

[1] Art. "Clement of Alexandria," by Charles Biggs and James Donaldson, *Encycl. Brit.*[11]

[2] See Struckmann, work cited, pp. 99, 100, 113.

Chapter XV.

WESTCOTT'S FEAR

WESTCOTT'S FEAR NOT YET STATED.
INDICATIONS WE HAVE HAD OF A FEAR.
THE FEAR AT LAST STATED.
PREVIOUS MENTION IN THIS ESSAY OF THE ERROR FEARED.
SO THIS FEAR WAS NOT CONCERNED WITH THE MATERIAL ELEMENTS ONLY WHEN THEY WERE RESERVED.
THE PATHOS IN THE LETTER.
THE PROVINCE OF WESTCOTT'S SCHOOL AND WHERE IT STOPPED SHORT.
REVERENCE, THE TRUE EXPLANATION OF WESTCOTT'S PERPLEXITY.
OUR FINAL SUBJECT OF INQUIRY.

BUT we have not yet come to the expression of Westcott's Fear.

THE INDICATIONS WE HAVE HAD OF A FEAR

True, we have had indications of Fear. We have had before us the meticulous care with which he guarded his adoption of Justin's use: the restricted permission he gave—apparently only to the two incumbents mentioned in his letter of 18th July 1899 to the chancellor of his diocese[1], for there seems to be no record of his giving it to others; his speech in Convocation regarding which he told the chancellor of his diocese in the said letter that he thought he had made it clear that it was not Reservation he allowed, that there was no question on which he felt more strongly, and that he could not understand how his action should have been misinterpreted; the letter he wrote the following November to his wife, in which he described the incident at Lambeth when in conversation with certain bishops the irregularities of certain clergy were discussed, written at the time of public anxiety over the Transvaal War which appeared to

[1] Chapter VII, p. 46.

him to be the starting of a fissure which if not arrested would proceed to the breaking-up of the great Empire of Britain, of whose beneficent influence for the peoples it comprised and mission for good for the world he was convinced, the transgressions of the clergy in question, trivial matters perhaps in themselves, seeming to him to be a parallel indication equally momentous and clear of a cleavage in the Church, the contest of two opposite forces—of those who maintained the Anglican position and those who would be satisfied with nothing but the re-admission of mediaevalism—here also inevitable; for which contest fighters for the side he believed in were needed, but with regard to which, as for himself, when he told the incident to his chaplain after his return home, he himself was no fighter.[1]

The Fear at last stated

The next year, 1900, on the First of May, as we have seen, the two Archbishops gave their Opinions exonerating Westcott and clearly explaining what he meant.[2] Perhaps with that so notable and public vindication and definite description he might have been satisfied, but that very year he was led—"compelled" he would likely have said—to express his fear in exact and precise terms, as apparently he had never expressed it before.

It happened in this way. The Archbishop of York, Dr. Maclagan, soon after giving his Opinion was called to his rest. That autumn the Church Congress was held at Newcastle-on-Tyne and the successor of Dr. Maclagan, the new Archbishop of the province in which it met, was invited to preach. In his sermon he reviewed the principles of the subject that had been brought into such prominent notice, and sent a copy of his sermon to the Bishop of Durham. The sending moved Westcott to write these two letters:

[1] Chapter IV, pp. 15, 16 and note p. 16.

[2] Chapter VIII.

To The Archbishop of York.

Bishop Auckland, 5th Oct., 1900.

My dear Archbishop,

Can you kindly tell me when you propose to issue your mandate for election of Proctors? I have had not a few enquiries on the subject. May I also thank you for the copy of your Congress sermon? I should like some time to have an opportunity of speaking on one grave point I am utterly unable to understand—how "the Body broken" and "the Blood shed" can be identified with the Person of the Lord. I find no warrant in our Prayer Book or ancient authorities for such an identification. But this is too great a subject for cursory writing; yet the more I see of modern statements the more I am amazed.

Ever yours most sincerely,

B. F. Dunelm.

Bishop Auckland, 8th Oct., 1900.

My dear Archbishop,

Let me thank you for your kindness in writing to me. I read your marginal note on p. 7 with great thankfulness.

As far as I venture to form an opinion on our Lord's presence in Holy Communion, I certainly agree with the view which you express on p. 8. The circumstances of the Institution are, we may say, spiritually reproduced. The Lord Himself offers His Body given and His Blood shed. But these gifts are not either separately (as the Council of Trent) or in combination Himself. The remarks of Archdeacon Freeman on this point are, I think, substantially true; and it is to be regretted that we habitually use part only of the words of Institution.

If I understand rightly the reference on p. 5 I do not feel sure that the words in St. John vi. can be pressed—though the use made of them is most true; are they not

of much wider application? Then, too, the Lord does speak of His "Body."

I shrink with my whole nature from speaking of such a mystery, but it seems to me vital to guard against the thought of the Presence of the Lord "in or under the forms of bread and wine." From this the greatest practical errors follow.

Perhaps I may add that I try to give the thought at the end of the first paragraph on p. 7 by saying "represent His human nature as He lived and died for us under the conditions of earthly life."

How soon we are lost. "In Christ" sums up all: "we are in Him; He in us."

Ever yours,

B. F. Dunelm.[1]

Here then we have reached the point towards which all through this essay we have been tending. We have reached Westcott's Fear.

Previous Mention in this Essay of the Error Feared

It was evidently this which had been in Westcott's mind in his careful regulations regarding Reservation. It was the view of Lanfranc, we see, to which he objected, the mode of apprehending the Presence at which Luther had halted on his way down the mediaeval ladder, the fashion of thought that Archbishop Frederick Temple had said in 1898 had come to be held by several clergy, and which he so strangely regarded as declared in the Bennett Judgment of the Privy Council to be agreeable to the formulas of the Church of England, which was exactly what that Judgment declared it was not, admitting as it did the ambiguity of the word "Sacrament," and statedly for that reason giving the accused the benefit of the doubt: by his announcement, however, that nevertheless that view had been declared then by "the Supreme Court of Appeal in Matters Ecclesiastical" to be allowable in law, laying down an "explosive," as we called it, by means of which the foundation, apparently

[1] *Life*, Vol. II, pp. 350–2.

maintained by the Opinions of 1900 that Reservation was illegal, and that the use Westcott permitted was not reservation and hence allowable, was as a matter of fact, even while it was laid down, fractured across and demolished.

Westcott's Fear was not concerned with the Material Elements, only from the time when they were reserved

We see accordingly that the fear Westcott felt lay deeper than the fear of the errors that commenced with extra-liturgical conveyance and use of the consecrated bread and wine conveyed. As to the impropriety of that, each for his own reasons, Luther and he were agreed. We shall remember that Luther's central reason was that it was only in the act of the Lord's giving to the communicant by means of the hand of His minister that His Body and Blood were bestowed under the forms of bread and wine. For Westcott, whether the material elements of the Celebration were outside the Celebration, or whether they were within it, even at the very moment when the Lord, as Luther maintained, was himself bestowing His gifts, His blessed Body and Blood were never under these forms. They were for, Westcott, elsewhere. He held, with Hooker, that they were present in the heart of the faithful receiver, the which he understood, to his soul's supreme satisfaction, to be the doctrine of the Church of England. We have him closing his second letter with the words "In Christ" sums up all: "we are in Him; He in us": words that, following immediately his exclamation "How soon we are lost," mean both a relief and a triumph.

Of the danger of Luther's view of the indwelling he is certain. "It seems to me vital"—we will notice how strongly he writes—"to guard against the thought of the Presence of the Lord 'in or under the forms of bread and wine.'" "From this," he insists, "the greatest practical errors follow."

We have got now to the root, it will be observed, of the danger in Westcott's judgment of Reservation practices. A wrong conception, he held, was involved of the Lord's

Presence, and the relation thereto of the material elements at the moment of the bestowal of the Body and Blood of the Lord in the service itself at which the Reservation took place.

The Pathos in the Letter

Yet, with all the clearly-worded insistence of these letters and their closing expression of triumph, the confession the writer seems driven to—"How soon we are lost"—may have surprised us. Here is a man, we conceive, who is suddenly arrested, brought to a standstill, not knowing his further way.

The Province of his School and where it stopped short

Perhaps we think we have come to the reason for this perplexity when we listen to these words of Dean Armitage Robinson of Wells preaching at Cambridge the University Sermon on 25th April, 1926, at a time when just the questions we have been discussing in this essay were stirring the air, and certain younger Cambridge scholars were investigating them and presenting their solutions.

The Dean spoke thus with allusion to the School of Westcott and Hort. "It is full forty years since I preached my first University sermon in this place. In those days our great theologians had laid deep foundations alike in historical and speculative theology. But the problems of the Eucharist were not among those to which their strenuous labours were devoted. Our difficulties are in the main other than theirs. But the temper of their studies is surely with us still. Have we no message for the times which shall reflect that temper, intense, sober, devout?"[1]

Thus did the preacher, himself a notable and progressive immediate successor in that School, admirably describe its temper, its width and depth, but also mentioned where it stopped short. Into the province of liturgy these enthusiastic students did not venture, nor did it seem to hold for them any real attraction.

[1] *Giving and Receiving*, being Six Plain Sermons on the Holy Eucharist, by J. Armitage Robinson, pp. 46, 47.

Reverence, the true explanation of Westcott's Perplexity

So far, no doubt, the limitation of his School, its stopping short at the investigation of the history and meaning of liturgies does explain Westcott's exclaiming he is lost; but it is by no means the main interpretation.

To begin with, we cannot think of Westcott, although he spent so much time and energy in the certainly wide enough province of his school, not having taken many a journey outside it, in not a few directions. The reader of this essay, which gives only a fragmentary impression of his eager mind, will have realised that. Prime among his adventures, especially, one would suppose, after his elevation to the episcopate, would be research not little in the field of liturgy. The point or two that come up in just these two letters prove that he had taken such journeys.

The form of the exclamation in itself helps us to understand. He may be thinking of himself primarily, but it seems to us more likely that he is using the phrase "How soon we are lost" in a general sense. Man as man, he means, entering on such questions soon comes to what outstrips his farthest endeavours. So it is not lack of acquaintance we take it, that is here, but a wisdom that has discovered how essentially beyond human knowledge such subjects are.

The disciple who writes this believes that here indeed his Master would have declared, as he did when questioned with regard to investigation into the spirit-world beyond the grave, that for investigation into such as this we do not in this life possess the faculties, that we must—we have no other choice—leave such questions alone.

But more. We see that it was not simply that the intellect was lost in exploring such a matter that Westcott here feels. The entire man drew back from expressing what he did think about it. We find him before his confession "How soon we are lost" exclaiming "I shrink with my whole nature from speaking of such a mystery." Here

then silence was his rule. What he does say when he breaks his silence, his disciple would urge, is, therefore, of all the more moment.

Our Final subject of inquiry

So our subject of inquiry, the final subject to which, as has just been said, our whole essay has been tending, comes to be to find out what exactly Westcott meant by his words in his letter written, in spite of this shrinking of his from any expression at all: "It seems to me vital to guard against the thought of the Presence of the Lord 'in or under the forms of bread and wine.' From this the greatest practical errors follow. . . . This I may say: 'represent His human nature as He lived and died for us under the conditions of earthly life.' 'In Christ' sums up all: 'We are in Him; He in us.'"

There is something here evidently vital to be maintained: something also vital to be guarded against: there is something finally which comprises all that has to be maintained and secures us against invasion. What, then, were and are these?

Chapter XVI.

WHAT IS TO BE MAINTAINED

What is to be maintained.
The grades of the perfect life.
I. The height we may know.
II. The height beyond knowledge.
III. The holy ground of lowly attainment.
Westcott's avoidance of the term "mystic."
The nature of Westcott's mysticism.
Westcott's insistence upon action.
The act is the man.

What is to be maintained

What then was it that Westcott was so anxious should be maintained? We see at once as we read the closing words we have just quoted of the second of his two letters: "'In Christ' sums up all." It was the Perfect Life.

The Grades of the Perfect Life

As we consider what we have already learned from Westcott, both from the esoteric lectures we described in our Fourth Chapter which were given in the upper room of the Divinity School to the eager students ready to hear,[1] and also from his enthusiasm for the parochial adoption of Justin's method of inclusion of the absentees in the Holy Eucharist, we see three grades in the Perfect Life as he presents it. First, the height we may know; secondly, the height beyond knowledge; and thirdly, the holy ground of lowly attainment.

I. The Height we may know

To have before us again the height we may know let us listen again to him as, in the presence of his eager audience, one generation of students after another, during his twenty years

[1] Chapter IV, pp. 19, 20.

of his Regius Professorship of Divinity in Cambridge, his face lighted up, as we have already described, he proceeds with his theme. We find him, for example, saying: "Note how the brief records we possess of the Perfect Life shew in distinct and harmonious outlines a character which presents the fullness of human powers, powers of action and thought and feeling, of command and sympathy and influence, powers characteristic of man and woman, shewn naturally with absolute majesty and grace."[1] Here is the life which "meets us at every point in our strivings and discloses something to call out in us loftier endeavour."[2] "Our sense of the Lord's perfections grows"—to give in expanded form a thought we have already heard him expressing to these listeners[3]—"with our own moral advance. We see more of His beauty as our power of vision is disciplined and purified. The slow unfolding of life enables us to discern [in life] new meaning in His presence."[4]

Before us is the mountain-dweller describing the splendours in the midst of which he resides.

II. The Height beyond Knowledge

Such the splendours for him who has scaled the height far as man's thinking may go: but there is a height farther still with what splendours we may not know, Westcott insisted, above man's thinking and power.

Already we have heard him say in his evening discourses: "Beyond this comprehensive humanity there lies in that life something not of man, a conscious sovereignty over men and nature answering to the voice of unfailing knowledge, a vision which sees the truth of things beneath the phenomena of time."[5]

And elsewhere we find this: "We shall look upon the Incarnation," he writes, "the greatest conceivable thought, the greatest conceivable fact, not that we may bring it within the range of our present powers, not that we may

[1] *Gospel of Life*, p. 296.
[2] Id., p. 299.
[3] Chapter IV, p. 20.
[4] *Gospel of Life*, p. 300.
[5] Id., p. 297, already quoted in Chapter IV, p. 20.

measure it by standards of this world, but that we may learn from it a little more of the awful grandeur of life, that by its help we may behold once again that halo of infinity about common things which seems for us now to have vanished away, that, thinking on the phrase "the Word became flesh," we may feel that in, beneath, beyond the objects which we see and taste and handle, is a Divine Presence, that lifting up our eyes to the Lord in glory we may know that phenomena are not ends, but signs only of that which is spiritually discerned.

"And while we confess that clearness of vision cannot be gained when we turn towards such an object except by the loss of that which is characteristic of it, as we look at the sun shorn of its glory through a darkened glass or through the thick mists of earth, it will be our joy to place ourselves in that atmosphere of light which transfigures all that falls upon it.

"We are on the point in these days of losing the sense of the spiritual, the eternal, as a present reality, as the only reality. Thought is not all: conduct is not all: life is unspeakably impoverished if it is unhallowed by the sanctities of reverence and worship."[1]

III. The Holy Ground of Lowly Attainment

But we have also to remember "the green sward" at the foot of the lofty height, the "green sward" we spoke of, which Calvin brought men down to, who were still clinging to the aerial ladder of a strange metaphysic, fancying that by it they could clamber into the far-away heaven (the green sward of this homely earth where in lowly paths we may walk with God, each of us, although no metaphysicians, nor indeed mountain-dwellers) when, having thought out the meaning of the Sacrament with the elder reformers and going beyond them, he said, giving the general truth and the call of the Ordinance to all, the Body and Blood of the Lord are to be found "in the heart of the faithful receiver."

[1] *Thoughts on Revelation and Life : selections from the writings of* ***B. F.*** *Westcott*, by Stephen Phillips, pp. 83, 84.

No man rejoiced more over that than Westcott. Was not the surpassing attraction, all other attractions feeble in comparison, in Justin's method for him as he saw it (its imperfection of method and inner defection forgotten as he placed over it the frame of English parochial Order of to-day) that by that method the circle of those met in Communion would be extended, so as to include, not only the presumably influential and alert folk of the parish as they met in vigour of life in their parish church, but also the sick absentee, perhaps deemed of little importance, but one of the circle of communicants and his inclusion necessary for its completeness.

We may have noticed indeed how, all through his glowing descriptions of the view from the height, Westcott never forgot the pathways of simple faith and everyday practice that lie below. It was indeed for him the glory of the One Perfect Life, that, kindling so far above, it transfigured, if its light were walked in and lived in, the lowliest efforts with the radiance of a glorious hope of final attainment. Thus he writes: "If we have felt one touch of the spirit which should animate our contemplation of Christ Born, Crucified, Ascended for us; if we have realised one least fragment of the end to which our work is directed, we shall know what the blessing is; know what it is to see with faint and trembling eyes depth below depth opening in the poor and dull surface of the earth; to see flashes of great hope shoot across the weary trivialities of business and pleasure; to see active about us, in the face of every scheme of selfish ambition, powers of the life to come; to see in the struggles of the forlorn and distressed fragments of the life which 'the poor man' Christ Jesus lived; to see over all the inequalities of the world, its terrible contrasts, its desolating crimes, its pride, its lust, its cruelty, one over-arching sign of God's purpose of redemption, broad as the sky and bright as the sunshine; to see in the Gospel a revelation of love powerful even now to give a foretaste of the unity of creation, powerful hereafter to realise it."[1]

[1] Work cited, p. 84.

Westcott's avoidance of the term "Mystic"

In our study of Westcott's teaching it is important to notice that in spite of his reputation of being a "mystic" he himself had no liking to use the term. He writes thus to the Dr. J. Ll. Davies: "I don't think that I have even used the word 'mystic': it is so hopelessly vague, and it suggests an esoteric teaching which is wholly foreign to the Christian. But from Cambridge days I have read the writings of many who are called mystics with much profit. Everyone who believes that phenomena are 'signs' of the spiritual and external receives the name; and to believe in the Incarnation involves this belief, does it not?"[1]

The Nature of Westcott's Mysticism

The Hon. Victoria Lady Welby held a long consultation with the Bishop by letters and occasional interviews on life's deepest problems. It arose, she tells us, in a communication in the Bishop's *Life* written by his son Arthur, from her reading the Bishop's *Commentary on St. John's Gospel*, when she was abroad at Algiers in 1880, and lasted until shortly before the Bishop left in 1901 this mortal scene. Westcott's replies throughout the period to her questions are most instructive and illuminating and are reproduced in the Bishop's *Life*.[2]

His pupil, in her brief introduction to those letters, faces the question of the Bishop's alleged mysticism. She writes thus: "In the study I had with Bishop it came home to me with special force that beyond the scholar, beyond the theologian, beyond even the saint, there was revealed a thinker of spiritual insight in a deeper than mystical sense, as 'mystical' is usually understood and used. . . . The subjects on which our correspondence and interviews alike turned brought out with peculiar emphasis his deep sense of the difficulties inherent in giving, as it were, the thoughts of the morning after the darkness, in the language of the

[1] Letter to Rev. J. Ll. Davies, written from Bishop Auckland, 4th Dec., 1899. *Life*, II, 309.

[2] Id., II, pp. 71–90.

evening before it. . . . Accordingly much that the Bishop actually said or wrote is inevitably for most of us hard to interpret by current or conventional standards. . . . To me it seems that this really prophetic, this more than predictive, element in the Bishop's thought may well become clearer in days to come, when we shall have learned more perfectly to distinguish between that which is but passing form and that which is of living and enduring value."[1]

Westcott's Insistence on Action

The place we should give to Westcott among the mystics, for mystic in a sense he certainly was, must be decided by noticing how he insists upon action.

In the evening lectures we have alluded to, with all the intellectual splendours he there revelled in around him, we find him saying: "It cannot be too often repeated that neither knowledge nor feeling is an end for man; we seek to know more truly and to feel more justly that we may fulfil our part in life with more perfect service;"[2] and in other writing than that which records the substance of these evening lectures: "The noblest truths are not given us for an intellectual luxury, still less for a moral opiate or a spiritual charm. They are for the inspiration of our whole being, for the hallowing and for the bracing of every power, outward and inward, with which we are endowed, for use in the busy field of common duty,"[3] and—to quote again from what we may call his "mountain discourses": "Right Doctrine is an inexhaustible spring of strength if it be translated into deed: it is a paralysis if it be held as an intellectual notion. Nor can we conceive any impediment to the fulfilment of duty more fatal than the outward retention of a formal Creed under such conditions that each article in it is mantained deliberately in theory without regard to its moral realisation."[4]

[1] *Life*, II, pp. 70–71.
[2] *Gospel of Life*, p. 4.
[3] *Thoughts from Westcott*, p. 249.
[4] *Gospel of Life*, p. 58.

The Act is the Man

To this constant appeal of his, that action was an integral part of the Christian life, Westcott set his seal, we may say, in what may be called his "scholastic farewell," the sermon[1] he gave in the chapel of his college, Trinity, at Cambridge, at the Annual Commemoration of Benefactors, on December 11, 1900, and so just two months after the letters which we presented, written to the Archbishop of York in the previous October on "In Christ" as "summing up all," and seven months before he was called in the providence of God in the following July at the age of 76, as we have noticed, to his rest. With many notable people before him, who had been invited to hear him, the preacher reviewed the fifty-six years that had passed since he had, as he put it, "in this Chapel and in these courts seen visions as it was promised[2] that young men should see them in the last days, visions which," he said, "had been in their outward circumstances immeasurably more than fulfilled." He said he had had "an unusually long working time and unequalled opportunities of service." With his habitual humility he acknowledged he had "failed, failed often and grievously," but not because he had "once seen an ideal," but because he had not looked on it "constantly, steadily, faithfully": because "he had not trusted himself and distrusted others": because he had "again and again lost the help of sympathy since he was unwilling to claim from those 'who called him friend' the sacrifice he himself was ready to make." So now "as an 'old man' he 'dreamed dreams'[2] of great hope," when he pleaded, as he said he did then, with those who "would carry forward what his own generation had left unattempted."

He spoke solemnly of the call of the time. He noted that it had been well said that a creed which had long moved men to action might at last cease to move them, and that

[1] Given with the title "Life" in *Lessons from Work*, pp. 285–301.

[2] Joel ii. 28.

not because it was untrue, but because it had been incompletely presented. It was so, he said, at the time he spoke. The old forms of belief, he knew it was confessed, had lost much of their power. He could see little hope in the restoration of mediaeval types of practice or thought: little hope in the adoption of sensational methods of teaching. The cure for the malady was, he said, a "fresh study of the Incarnation." That would reveal what was needed, namely, "a development of new relations between men, and a calling into play of vital forces hitherto inadequately recognised, for the Incarnation claimed from men limitless service and offered them limitless power to fulfil its claims. A change in the aspect of life was what the time needed, and that demand and that promise which the Incarnation implied gave the change that was wanted." He reminded his audience of the powers of the Divine life that should rule every department of human activity, and then declared that in that yielding to Divine power and rule the Cambridge motto had its place, "I act, therefore I am."[1]

As we hear these closing words of our extract we seem to meet a challenge to the motto Descartes laid down, "I think, therefore I am," which became the foundation-stone of modern philosophy. And we find we are right. For this mention of "the Cambridge motto" attracted attention, and someone writing to Westcott for explanation drew from him the following reply:

"I thought that everyone was familiar with Whichcote [the Cambridge Platonist]'s[2] saying, perhaps because I have dwelt on it and quoted it so long. He was, to my mind, a truly representative Cambridge man, and the way in which he repeats the words leads me to think that it was a

[1] *Lessons from Work*, p. 294.

[2] Benjamin Whichcote (1609–1683), Fellow of Emmanuel College, Cambridge, and afterwards Provost of King's and Vice-Chancellor of the University, is regarded as the founder of the Cambridge Platonists, "a school of philosophico-religious thinkers which flourished mainly at Cambridge University in the second half of the seventeenth century." [*Encycl. Brit.*[11]]

watchword in his time—an answer, and, as I think, a complete answer to 'Cogito, ergo sum'."[1]

Westcott has an Essay on Whichcote[2] in which he notes that Whichcote was made Provost of King's in the year 1644, the very year Descartes published his Latin version of his *Discourse on Method* which had first appeared seven years before in French. He is careful to observe, however, that "Whichcote, as he paraphrases his memorable echo and answer to the French philosopher's motto, will have it understood that I act not as my own maker, not as my own sustainer, but as the creature and servant of Him who is the original of all: who is 'to be adored as the chiefest beauty and loved as the first and chiefest good': who hath given us a large capacity which He will fulfil and a special relation to Himself which He will answer."[3]

We are to notice, however, that, whatever was understood or misunderstood by Whichcote with regard to Descartes, Descartes did not exclude God from his philosophy. In his second great work *Meditations on the First Philosophy* (*The Discourse*), in which he expounds in more detail the foundations of his system, he lays special emphasis on the absolute and ultimate dependence of mind as well as body on the existence of God.[4]

In *Lessons from Work*, Westcott gives his reason for his adoption of Whichcote's motto: "Thought and word are only parts of the consecrated energy of the whole man. Thought may, nay must, leave us face to face with unsolved and insoluble difficulties. Words may fail to express the feelings and impulses by which we are moved. But the living act, however inadequately and imperfectly, does answer in some extent to the sum of our powers."[5]

Apropos there comes with this bringing forward as the Cambridge motto, "I act, therefore I am," at his survey of

[1] *Life*, II, p. 328.
[2] One of the Essays in *Religious Thought in the West*.
[3] *Religious Thought in the West*, p. 367.
[4] *Encycl. Brit.*[11] art. "Descartes," p. 82.
[5] *Lessons from Work*, pp. 220–1.

his life's activity near its close, mention of the text he chose years before upon which to preach his first sermon: 1 John ii. 17: "The world passeth away, and the desire thereof: but he that doeth the will of God abideth for ever."[1]

[1] *Life*, I, p. 167. As a matter of fact, when the time to preach the sermon came, the thought occurred to him of a somewhat similar text, Rom. xii. 1: "Present your bodies a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable to God," and it was that which he took for his sermon. We are told by his son Arthur, in a note, that he used to declare that that text contained all that he had since preached; yet one feels that his years-before-chosen text, with its deeper significance, conveys better what we would imagine especially such as he would choose for such an occasion when contemplation is natural of the course of one's ministry and the Life Beyond.

Chapter XVII.

FURTHER STUDY

A summary of the previous chapter.
The Mystery in the Perfect Life and the Vastness of the Life.
The Body and Blood of the Perfect Life.
The three grades and the two orders.
The Eternal Order.
The Person of Christ.
The activity of the Triune God.
The reality of the Sacramental Bread and Wine.
The Relation of the Incarnation to the Creation.

A Summary of the previous Chapter

So then we have had brought before us the Perfect Life. In moving language we have been told its high splendours, made aware that there are splendours yet higher that cannot be known, had described to us its lowly paths where not less truly it is to be recognised and practised. Such is the Christ.

The Mystery in the Perfect Life and the Vastness of the Life

And the chief wonder is that all this is to be realised as present in ourselves and in the world round about us: even in its quality of containing the unknown. In a striking passage in his evening lectures Westcott says: "In themselves men and the world are as truly unknowable as God is unknowable. . . . It is utterly impossible for us ever to separate the thought from the thinking person, to separate what belongs to man from that unknown something which when apprehended by him produces such and such an impression or is realised in such and such a form."[1] Also, there is the vastness of this wondrous life. "Our thoughts are raised," Westcott says in the same discourses, "to a vaster life

[1] *Gospel of Life*, p. 203.

than that which is realised individually, a life in which humanity becomes one," yet "a life which is not an abstraction, not simply a participation in a common nature but (as we apprehend it) personal." Indeed, "whatever is, He is. There is but one life."[1] All this—in us, since we in Him!

The Body and Blood of the Perfect Life

But perhaps this view of the Life is disconcerting, unsatisfying to us, just because of the mystery in it and its vastness.

Then there comes to us recollection of the evangelist's record in which he portrays the Lord risen from the dead, saying to the disciples: "See My hands and My feet, that it is I Myself; for a spirit hath not flesh and bones as ye behold Me having"; and while they still disbelieved, saying unto them, "Have ye here any thing to eat?" "And they gave Him a piece of a broiled fish, and He took it and did eat before them."[2] Or we remember these words at the opening of St. John's First Epistle: "That which we have heard, that which we have seen with our eyes, that which we beheld, and our hands handled, concerning the Word of Life, declare we unto you also."[3] But perhaps we are not yet satisfied. St. Luke writes of one risen from the dead; St. John, of one the reality of whose flesh he wrote his Gospel specially to shew, whom nevertheless he describes the disciples beholding walking upon the sea, at which sight they are afraid as the Lord draws nigh to their boat, so that He has to assure them with the words, "It is I," and they receive Him into the boat with them.[4] So, searching still further for that which is familiar, there come to our minds the synoptic narratives which bring before us "a man" wonderful indeed in both word and work, claiming in the collection of his sayings we know as the "Sermon on the Mount" that men at the Last Day shall appeal to him and meet their judgment according to his word, wonderful as

[1] *Gospel of Life*, p. 234.
[2] St. Luke xxiv. 39–43.
[3] 1 John i. 1–3.
[4] St. John vi. 19.

declaring himself as "the Son unto whom all things have been delivered by the Father, whom no one save the Father knoweth, and than whom none other knoweth the Father, except he to whom the Son willeth to reveal Him,"[1] yet "a man" at the head of his little band of disciples, moving through those hills of Galilee, with the fishermen on the shore and on the waters of the lake, with the multitudes on the grassy uplands before him, listening to him and receiving at his hands and voice help from heaven as they never deemed might have been granted them, a man in plain fact, although mystery presses, as we are. Here, we cry, is body in verity as ours, the blood that is ours is warm in these veins. The Perfect Life in our body and blood is before us!

The Three Grades and the Two Orders

We are thus partly disturbed and partly satisfied when we consider the Perfect Life: disturbed by its height and its vastness, satisfied when we find in it the familiar aspect, the foremost and usual aspect, of Jesus as his history is set forth in the earlier gospels.

There was a nearness we yearned for. We have found it. We were somewhat like Luther who, as he looked up at the Ascended, felt how far away was the Saviour, and was glad to find His body and blood in the bread and wine. But that, we saw, was not the right sort of nearness for Westcott, even though the bread and wine were taken in with the lips.

It behoves us then both for our own sakes, and that we the better understand Luther's dismay and its cure, to consider more particularly what the Perfect Life is.

It is evident, we may begin with saying, that the Perfect Life for us men is as God has created it, as we are told on the opening page of the Bible, an image of Himself and after His likeness, and when we mention Humanity we are to remember that Man in the narrative referred to is declared

[1] St. Matt. xi. 27.

to be the acme and head of the physical universe. So we might, or rather ought to, say, the Perfect Life is the Universe in all its fulness, life conscient and senscient, and the material tissue in which Life moves. Westcott strongly insisted[1] that Life was One. There again is the height and vastness, and yet man's place in the height and his call to fulfil his true nature and destiny.

In our parable we presented this Life, the One Perfect all-containing Life, in a single picture as a great mountain above which soared the zenith and beneath which lay the green sward of the plain; and we noted that that meant three grades, the zenith soaring far away overhead, the mountain top and the green sward below. We may now explain the relation of these three grades to each other by asking the reader to note the Two Orders which we have already mentioned that Westcott insisted should be always remembered and kept each quite distinct in the mind, the Eternal which is beyond space and time and the Temporal which is in space and time. The zenith in our parable is the Eternal, the meadow and glade at the mountain's foot, the Temporal, and the summit is for creatures who possess our grade of consciousness, the Meeting-place where the Eternal impinges on the Temporal and gives those who ascend the mountain some sense of its glory. The mountain-top is in brief simply that, a Meeting-surface, a Borderland, as it were, where the Two Orders are apprehended to be in touch with each other. Yet we are not to think that, while for us men only there in a visionary and cloudy region the two orders are seen to meet, it is only there and above the clouds that float there that the Higher Order exists. It extends as a matter of fact all the way down the hillside to the green sward and glades, and beneath these to the lowest parts of the earth. It is, we shall remember we have been taught, the creative order, to which the whole Lower Order, the Temporal and Spatial Order, owes its existence.

[1] e.g. quotation on p. 129 from *Gospel of Life* p. 234.

The Eternal Order

Let us next consider more particularly the Eternal Order. It possesses, we shall find, three characteristics. First, it is beyond space and time. Secondly, it is the seat of Personality; the triune God is there. Thirdly, it is composite of all the virtues. When we ponder over these characteristics we see that the dominating characteristic is the second. The essence of the Eternal Order is that it is Personal. That it is beyond space and time is its metaphysics. That it is the interweaving of all the virtues is its activity.

The Person of Christ

It is that we should guard the supremacy of the Person of Christ that Westcott is anxious, when he writes in his first letter on what he calls "a grave point," "I am utterly unable to understand how 'the Body broken' and 'the Blood shed' can be identified with the Person of the Lord"; and in his second: "The Lord Himself offers His Body given and His Blood shed. But these gifts are not either separately (as the Council of Trent) but in combination Himself": and further [with regard to Luther] "It seems to me vital to guard against the thought of the Presence of the Lord 'in or under the forms of bread and wine.' From this the greatest practical errors follow."

What Westcott means we can see when we consider personality as we find it in ourselves. The person, we acknowledge, is assuredly not to be identified even with his life or with any expression of himself.

We can feel then how intensely Westcott must have felt the degradation involved, when we remember that here the supreme Personality of his most august visions was affected. We are not to think indeed of the Presence in the Holy Eucharist being only that of the Son. In the Holy Trinity there is perfect unison and co-working. When God is present, the one glorious God is present, Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. Our reformers' mind was towards that when they placed as a commencement to the old Canon or Rule

of the service the heart-uplifting prayer to the Father, the fount of the Trinity, that He who gave the Son might grant that those who received His creatures of bread and wine should receive the Body and Blood of His Son, which the Son under His Father's sending bestowed. But it was on the Son that Westcott's mind was at this moment fixed, the Blessed Person by whom all things created of the Father have come into existence, who became flesh and dwelt among us.[1] That "dwelling" among men was indeed only for a while. "Tabernacled"[2] is the literal translation of the Greek word in the Gospel; "tarried," the translation given by one of our scholars.[3] Yet the Person "in the tent" was eternal. Westcott somewhere[1] writes of "the unchanged and unchangeable Personality in heaven" of Him who "became incarnate in time."[4] Such then, as he pondered over the mystery, was for him the personality of the Son. We shall remember how in St. John's Gospel we have in the conversation of Jesus with Nicodemus, even as the Lord sits there, the sentence, not found in some ancient manuscripts, but certainly expressing a truth—"He who hath descended out of heaven, even the Son of Man who is in heaven."[5] So was His personality in heaven, reigning at the right hand of His Father while He was under the conditions of His earthly life. In His person He was on the throne while He gave to His disciples His body and blood on the night of His betrayal.

We can understand then Westcott's perplexity that this Personality, not only, as all Personality must be, beyond space and time, but regnant at the Father's right hand in that high region, should be identified with His Body and Blood, or conceived of as "in or under" the bread and the wine.

The injury here on personality as such might perhaps not be realised, and so no harm come thereby to the thinker; but there was certainly in the concept what was worse, a "laesa majestas" of the divine, Westcott evidently felt,

[1] St. John i. 3. [2] eskēnōse, St. John i. 14. [3] James Moffatt.
[4] In letter to the Hon. Victoria Lady Welby, Westcott's *Life*, II, 83.
[5] St. John iii. 13.

although it is not to be thought for a moment that that import of the concept enters the consciousness of those who entertain it. They intend all loyalty to the divine. Yet what is the essential meaning of our apprehension of God, even if that meaning be in our mind only on certain occasions, especially if these be occasions such as of our attendance at the holy eucharist, when earth is linked with heaven, must certainly make a strong directive impress on our lives.

"It seems to me to be vital," said our Bishop, "to guard against the thought of the Presence of the Lord in or under the Bread and the Wine. From this the greatest practical errors follow."

The Activity of the Triune God

But, as we have said, this higher order of the zenith did not remain there. It was and is not, to use the terms of man's thought, simply metaphysical. Its essence was and is Personality, and its activity an interweaving of all the virtues. And in that possession of Personality as its centre, and of the virtues in action as its activity, we seem to see, looking and searching if a man may dare, wherefore it was that the glorious triune God should be creative.

We likened the Perfect Life to a great mountain with its deep hidden foundation, its green sward open to light and air, and over the mountain the endless zenith. So we can picture in parable the divine activity, God, beginning by working in the depths beneath with His Spirit and by His word, summoning into existence the pulses of electricity our scientific explorers tell us about, which are known only by calculation, the beginnings, many of us are now imagining, of life. "In the Word," St. John tells us, was "life."[1]

And perhaps a greater wonder than the Father's thus bringing the world into existence is the advance we notice of the created; how, begun with these impulses insentiate, blind, whose varied arrangements make up "the material elements" as we call them, there came to be at last, when

[1] St. John i. 4.

temperature was at a certain grade and there was sunshine and air—we have arrived now at the green sward of our mountain—the successive ever developing sentient life, and then in man conscient life ("the life in the word" has become "the light of men"[1]), a constant building up, as we cannot but see, of the world by God nearer to Himself seated all the while in the zenith above the clouds which give to men some notion of His glory. Thus, while we notice fallings-away in this finite order of being, a fate which seems to be characteristic of it, yet we witness by no means an entire breaking or a frustrating as a whole of the building-up, but rather a preservation of its being and bringing of the whole into fuller development.

In these two aspects of creation, the certainty, as they affect us, of the material movements called into being, and the orderly advance of the whole, our thinker rejoiced.

The Reality of the Sacramental Bread and Wine

So we may be certain that, had Westcott been working out this part of the theme of our essay, as we, using his teaching as a lamp, are humbly endeavouring to do, he, rejoicing in this founding and progress of the physical world, would have been thankful that Luther had crept down the mediaeval ladder so far, coming to accept the reality of the bread and wine, the reality which indeed the very act of the Lord giving them as food requires. For Westcott the Incarnation, the flesh and blood of which is transmitted in the Eucharist, caused no break in the natural order, but brought the advance we have noted to its perfecting. We know how St. Paul, alluding to the Fall, speaks of the "earnest expectation of the creation" waiting for "the revealing of the sons of God" to be delivered then "from the bondage of corruption into the liberty of the glory of the children of God."[2]

True, Westcott pointed out that the natural order was not supreme. "Each of the sciences within its own domain," he declared, was "supreme, but beyond that it possessed no

[1] St. John i. 4. [2] Rom. viii. 19–21.

authority;"[1] and he pointed out that "the struggle begun since the Fall, between the life reconciled to God and the life still broken and disordered, could never be ended in the Visible Order."[2]

Yet he believed firmly in the actuality of "such certainties in the universe as man can obtain and by which he lives,"[3] and adored the Wisdom that had so ordained.

The Relation of the Incarnation to the Creation

It is of much interest to consider Westcott's view of the relation of the Incarnation to the Creation.

These two questions Westcott put to himself: What was the relation of the Perfect Life to the World? and, secondly, what the relation of that Life to mankind?

It has been maintained that the coming of the Perfect Life into the world was an entirely new thing, an event foreordained by God only as all things are foreordained by Him, for whom past, present and future are one, but in the realm of time and space a new thing in the course of God's providence, an interposition of His love, occasioned by the Fall.

This, Westcott maintained, the Incarnation was not. He held that it had already been in decree and act of the Creator when He founded the world. He pointed to the statement, "God made man in His own image and after His likeness."[4] Such was the original man. The "likeness" to God came with "Jesus."

Accordingly, for Westcott, the Incarnation was not dependent upon the Fall. The Fall was indeed a terrible interlude. It altered the conditions in which the Incarnation took place, but it was not its cause. It was for Westcott a marvel, the contemplation of which moved him to adoration of God, that in spite of the Fall the Creator should have effected that which, in order that the world might be brought to a glorious consummation, he had already included potentially in its foundation.[5]

[1] *Gospel of Life*, pp. 89, 90. [2] Id., p. 278.
[3] Id., p. 90. [4] Gen. i. 26, 27.
[5] See Westcott in his Essay on the "Gospel of Creation" in his Commentary on the Epistles of St. John.

Secondly: what, then, was the relation of the Perfect Life the "likeness to God," to the mankind that had existed before the Perfect Life came? Westcott maintained that, although the "Likeness" did not appear until at such time as God willed, God had placed it in man at the beginning. He pointed out that "God made man in His image[1] and after His likeness" is described as one act. True, at the beginning the "likeness" was hidden: but it was there, in Man, at the beginning, to come out eventually, whether the Fall had taken place or not.

To put Westcott's view into a parable for ourselves: the Incarnation was in Man as the flower is in the seed, to break out eventually when the stem has arrived at a certain foreordained stage of its growth.

So, for Westcott, Man at his very beginning had in him the likeness of God. His history indeed falls into two periods, the first of Man not yet having attained his true self, that "likeness of God"; the second, not of Super-Man but of Man's true self at last in mercy enabled, when the Perfect Life, "Perfect Man," (as the Athanasian Creed expresses it), the "likeness of God," even Jesus, was manifested, sent by the Father. In Jesus Man at last attained that which had been implanted in him for his striving towards at his commencement.

We accordingly find Westcott imprint as fore-mottos of his Essay on the "Gospel of Creation," first the text "God is Love" from the First Epistle of St. John as on the cornice of the portico, and then, beneath that, as on the frieze thereof, the opening words of the Epistle: "That which was from the beginning, concerning the Word of Life [declare we unto you]."

[1] In the Hebrew of Gen. i. 26, 27, "image" is "tselem," the radical meaning of "tselem" being, according to Brown, Driver and Briggs's Hebrew Lexicon, "something cut out"; and "likeness" is "d'mūth," which, according to the same authority, refers to "external appearance," and is derived from the verb "dāmāh," "be like," "resemble."

Chapter XVIII.

THE PRIORITY OF THE INCARNATION

THE INCARNATION IN ITS INCIDENCE IS PRIOR TO THE SACRAMENTS.
THE ORIGINAL FORM OF THE SACRAMENTS IS TO BE PRESERVED.
THE INCARNATION FUNDAMENTAL.
THE THREE ASPECTS OF THE PERFECT LIFE THUS MANIFESTED.
THESE ASPECTS ARE PROCLAIMED WITH REGARD TO JESUS.
THIS IS GOD'S WORLD AND SO ONLY THE PERFECT LIFE CAN SAVE IT.

THE INCARNATION IN ITS INCIDENCE IS PRIOR TO THE SACRAMENTS

LET us notice here that in its incidence the Incarnation was prior to the institution of Sacraments. First came the Lord, then the Sacraments.

It was One who had already come and had ascended from whom St. Paul received that on the night of His betrayal He gave the bread and the contents of the cup as His body and blood, and commanded His disciples to do so in remembrance. Whatever may be the relation of the Last Supper to what St. Paul thus received, the Lord did at that last common meal give His body and blood in the death He had come to Jerusalem to accomplish, and which was fulfilled on the morrow: and from Him the Apostle received that His disciples should do in His memory what He did at that last Supper: not indeed, the Apostle explains, in memory of one who should no more return, but in memory of one who should certainly return with the Kingdom of God. Our point is, however, that the Lord in what St. Paul received from Him is shown manifest in His body Himself dispensing His gifts. Nor is this the first dispensing of His body. If that be the giving of His body in death shown forth in a

ritual act made known to St. Paul, we have St. John describing to us the Lord declaring that His Father's enabling Him to feed the multitude with a few loaves and fishes was a sign that He was "the bread of God coming down from heaven and giving life to the world," which means the dispensing of His body in its birth and activity.

So too with Holy Baptism. It is the Lord risen from the dead who commands it, the Lord ascended who sends down the Spirit.

All this is accepted: but are its implications always remembered? It is the Lord who gives the Sacraments, not the Sacraments that give the Lord.

The original form of the Sacraments is to be preserved

Also, of each Sacrament there will, of course, be an endeavour to preserve the original form and words. It can hardly but be desired by those who face the question that the first direction in our Orders of Infant and Adult Baptism should be so sufficiently observed that the Church should become aware of what is the original form of baptism, and thus realise better its meaning and power under God.

So too in regard to the Eucharist, we find Westcott in his second letter saying: "The circumstances of the Institution in our conduct of it are, we may say, spiritually reproduced"; and, anxious that the reproduction of the original should be still more exactly carried out, adding: "It is to be regretted that we habitually use part only of the words of Institution."

Not that the literal reproduction is what matters. It is on God we depend, not on an act or repetition of words. It is the "spiritual" reproduction, as Westcott puts it, we are to try to make sure of. We have seen how our reformers inserted certain explanations into the words of Administration of the bread and wine of the Eucharist in order that those who received these might know what the gifts bestowed to the faithful really are. Yet, while spiritual, a "reproduction" it is to be. The ritual of to-day is not to prevent

those who witness or experience a baptism or join in the Agape and Eucharist from being in genuine possession of the act and words and, in the case of the Eucharist, the circumstance (for there is circumstance there, that gives what is done and said their significance) of the original institution.

The Incarnation Fundamental

But this priority of the Lord to His Sacraments as Himself the Giver of the gifts therein bestowed was not the main thought in Westcott's mind when he pondered over the Incarnation. His main thought was, as we have noted, the priority of the Incarnation as included in the mind of God at the beginning of time in His plan of the Universe. It was the original creation that was in Jesus perfected, not another world brought in; as St. Paul states, while he makes clear the distinction between the first man "of the earth earthy" and the second man, who is "of heaven,"[1] and declares that in Christ is a new creation,[2] yet denominates Jesus the second Adam,[3] the New Man. In Jesus, Westcott accordingly insisted, the original Universe was by no means subverted or displaced but brought to its perfecting.

Our student of Scripture points out the place given to the Son in the opening chapter of the Epistle to the Colossians. He says: "We seem to be here (vv. 13–20) admitted by St. Paul to look upon the Truth as it is in the divine counsel with regard to Creation and re-Creation, the apostle presenting to us a view of "the work of 'the Son of God's Love' in the creation, preservation, redemption, consummation, of finite being. The whole work is fulfilled by one Person who is before Creation, and who is also the source of peace 'through the Blood of His Cross' . . . Here we have Christ spoken of in one place as 'the image of the invisible God,' that is to say, as the archetype of humanity, and in another presented as 'the first-born from the dead'."[4]

[1] 1 Cor. xv. 47.
[2] Gal. vi. 15.
[3] 1 Cor. xv. 45.
[4] Essay on "Gospel of Creation" in *Commentary on the Epistles of St. John*, p. 323.

Looking across the world, Westcott maintained in the following manner the validity of what he had thus discerned: "The wider view of the relations of man to Creation tends to confirm the inherent fitness of the Incarnation in relation to the plan of Creation, as we are enabled to look upon it. In all parts of the natural order, and not in humanity only, in the very course of its progress there is constant division, dispersion, differentiation of elements; and at the same time clearer glimpses are opened of a unity to which all parts appear to tend. The separation and the unity, as far as we can see, belong alike to the essence of things. The separation has been, it is true, influenced by the Fall, but as a condition of growth it is not due to it. The idea of the Incarnation, therefore, satisfies the aspiration towards the vaster unity to which the full development of Creation points. The restoration of unity to man carries with it the promise of the restoration of unity to all finite being."[1]

Thus was in Westcott's teaching, as he opened out the Scriptures, the Incarnation fundamental, the deepest stratum, or, shall we not rather say, the frame set up to direct and reinforce the whole future building when God founded the Universe.

The Three Aspects of the Perfect Life

When we ponder over this we find three aspects of the Perfect Life as it is presented in Westcott's teaching.

The Perfect Life is the Universe as a whole, of matter, life and spirit. We had it pictured as a great mountain, with its foundation of the merely material, its green sward where sentient and conscient life move, and its zenith representing the Infinite above. That we would call the cosmic aspect of the Perfect Life.

But there is also the human aspect. The Perfect Life is Humanity in its completeness. We shall have noticed that it is on that Westcott has had most to say.

Thirdly, there is the Personal Aspect of the Perfect Life.

[1] Id., p. 323.

That of course is its essential aspect. The Perfect Life is throughout dependent for it very existence upon personality. We shall remember Westcott telling us, in a quotation at the beginning of the last chapter, in which we considered the vastness and mystery of the Life, that, although our thoughts are thus raised "to a vaster Life than that which is realised individually," yet it is to "a Life which is not an abstraction, not simply a participation in a common nature, but (as we apprehend it) personal."

These Aspects of the Perfect Life are proclaimed with regard to Jesus

We have seen how Westcott glories in the Lord, claiming that in Him the Perfect Life, as he thus understands it, has come. Do we find, then, testing as it were our teacher's exposition, the three aspects in Jesus which he seems to find necessary for the Perfect Life: the personal, the human, the cosmic. As we search the Scriptures we ansumer "Yes." We have already seen how the Gospels present him in that form of personality we know as "a man." But a higher Personality is declared for him than we realise, in our ordinary way, exhibited in the sons of men. He is revealed as "the Son of God,"[1] "the impress of God's substance";[2] yea as "God."[3] There we have Personality Supreme. There can be no mistaking it.

Again, it is accepted, is indeed the foundation of the Gospel, that in him was not simply "a man" as is in each of us individually, but Man generic, so that he, according to St. Paul, is the Second Adam. In Him all men, we are told, are saved; that is, brought to their true self in God.

The cosmic aspect also we find to be claimed. It is declared that through Him "God made the ages,"[4] that He was "the Word in the beginning,"[5] "the One through whom, as the Word, all existence came into being,"[6] that "in Him was life, and that the life was the light of men."[7]

[1] John i, 14. [2] Hebrew i. 3 (marg). [3] John i. 14.
[4] Hebrew i. 2 (margin.) [5] John i. 1.
[6] John i. 3 (Moffatt's translation). [7] John i, 4.

This is God's World and so only the Perfect Life can save it

Again, perhaps, as we depicted at the beginning of the last chapter, the mystery and the vastness of the Perfect Life appall us. Yet, when we shade our eyes, and think, we come to understand.

We recollect first that this is God's world, and before Him nothing unholy or unrighteous can stand. We recognise next the world includes personality, life, and material vastness. So we come to the conclusion that only the Perfect Life, in the fulness in which we have depicted it, can save it.

What does this necessity mean for us when we look straight into ourselves? It surely means the life in body and soul of perfect holiness and righteousness and truth and love must be ours. These are our characteristics as God created us. He made us in His image and after His likeness. If we do not show forth that image and strive after that likeness we not only dishonour the Almighty, but we destroy ourselves. Our conscience confirms the Scripture revelation of our origin and destiny, which we must fulfil or perish.

Chapter XIX.

THE PERFECT LIFE AND THE SACRAMENTS

THE PERFECT LIFE IS COME.
HOW THEN IS THE PERFECT LIFE TO BECOME OURS?
THE PERFECT LIFE IS JESUS.
THE WONDER OF THE LIFE THAT IS CHRIST.
YET WE CANNOT IN THIS PRESENT AGE BE LIKE JESUS AS HE REALLY IS.
IT IS THE PERFECT LIFE WHICH THE SACRAMENTS ARE GIVEN TO CONVEY.

THE PERFECT LIFE IS COME

BUT the Perfect Life, possessing the fulness we have depicted, *is* come. "The struggle has begun," as Westcott puts it.[1] There is the fact in which he rejoiced. It expanded itself like a glorious flower—a very rose aflame in heaven—in his imagination. For it was a struggle, he pointed out, that must end in triumph.

That fact was realised as men beheld Jesus. We have not only the inkling the multitude had, but the impression upon His disciples.

St. John puts it very strongly. He passes beyond these impressions upon men. He tells us that if we receive "the witness of men" "the witness of God is greater," and "God hath borne witness concerning His Son, and he that believeth not God hath made Him a liar."[2] And he tells us what this witness is; a deeper testimony than the miracles—these answers from His heavenly Father to Jesus at the call of His voice and the touch of His hand—which the multitudes beheld. The witness is that God "gave unto us eternal life, and this life is in His Son: He that hath the Son hath the life; and he that hath not the Son hath not the life."[3]

[1] *Gospel of Life*, p. 278.
[2] 1 John v. 9, 10.
[3] 1 John v. 11, 12.

The detail of that St. John exhibits in his Gospel. We there learn that when Jesus was born, the Birth of Man from above came, the Bread of Life, the Manna of heaven, was sent, that a man should eat thereof and not die. And, if this means that the Father had thus sent the Son, it also means, since here was a life that was lived, that the Son in His birth and life and death had given His flesh and blood. That indeed is told us plainly in Jesus' explanation to the multitude of the miracle of loaves, and in His telling the Jews in the synagogue at Capernaum the need of men's partaking His flesh.

How then is this Perfect Life to become ours?

How then is this Perfect Life to become ours? We would answer, and this seems to be the constant insistence of Scripture: by Faith in the Fact. Simply Faith in the Fact. Once grant the Actuality of the Birth of Man, as Man, from above, Man sinless, all-righteous, in his true place and power in the Universe, the individual man must find himself in what he thus believes. He himself cannot but be changed, if he believe in that Work of God which in its very nature includes himself in its working.

That Faith in the Fact we find to be the constant message of St. Paul. His elaboration of it in his epistle is compressed as in a capsule in his cry to his trembling jailor at Philippi: "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved."

It was to kindle faith in the fact that the Apostle strove with the multitude at Lystra and the wise men at Athens. In the Romans he asks, "How shall they believe in Him of whom they have not heard? And how shall they hear without a preacher? And how shall they preach except they be sent? . . . to bring the glad tidings. . . So belief cometh of hearing and hearing by the word of Christ."[1] Thus was the "preacher" to feel himself "sent" ["sent by God" we shall understand when we remember the Apostle's own sending] as an ambassador to proclaim the Fact.

[1] Rom. x. 14–17.

The Perfect Life is Jesus

So then the Perfect Life is Jesus. It is the Life the Father in the beginning framed Man to be, making him in His own image and after His likeness: and He has brought each of us into that Perfect Life when He sent Jesus to be born and live and die. It follows that God has made our life, if we would be our true selves, the life of Jesus. Nay, the Apostle puts it more strongly, and as it evidently really is, we ourselves are no longer to live. We are to "live Jesus": "I live; and yet no longer live I, but Christ liveth in me. The life that I now live in the flesh, I live in the faith of the Son of God who loved me and gave Himself up for me."[1]

Here then is Jesus as the Bread sent down by the Father to give Himself up to us as bread does that we may live through Him. Here then is Jesus Himself giving, as He is described declaring at Capernaum, His flesh to be eaten. Here, again, is that giving of His Body and Blood, on the eve of His betrayal, to be partaken of that it may become the body and blood of each of his disciples.

"No longer I, but Christ lives in me." This flesh and blood of mine are His. What a stupendous fact is the Incarnation, when grasped at by Faith! How all sin must flee at the Faith in it and all righteousness spring therefrom! If it is so with us, and it ought to be so, we tremble with awe as we think of ourselves. How shall we dare sin or falter on our pathway onward, if we have this "faith of the Son of God."?

The Wonder of the Life that is Christ

"No longer live I. Christ lives in me." Let each consider the wonder! "My years now as they go are His years, my days, His days. He is my daily bread giving me immortality. Yea, more particularly: this life that is Christ, a life entirely spiritual, a life of death unto sin—I, have been crucified with Him,' says the Apostle[1]—this

[1] Gal. ii. 20.

life of the faith of the Son of God is nevertheless a life 'lived in the flesh;' only the sinful flesh is gone; the body and blood of Himself the All-holy has given to me in its place; my members are His members, each of them is spiritual now; this flesh is not the flesh of the Old Adam, but of the New; the blood that pulses in my veins is that New Man's; my voice is not mine nor my thoughts mine; my voice is His, my thoughts are His; His divine yearning over the spiritually lost He has given to me; my giving is His giving; His obedience to His Heavenly Father is mine. All the way through my life now, although my identity is not extinguished—nay, rather I am living now at last my true self—I am not I, but Christ.

"So it is to be also with my brethren. They are as I. I am to approach them as those in whom is my Master, to see glimpses of my Saviour in them, to catch the urge of His Spirit in their voice, signs of His activity in their deeds."

All this, it is to be always remembered, is spiritually discerned, and what is discerned is the spiritual. Solely spiritual is this total experience. It is the spiritual heart that is stirred by an emotion spiritual: the spiritual eye that beholds the spiritual: the spiritual ear that catches the spiritual. The life is a life in the flesh. A life in the flesh it is to be, for the ennobling of the flesh. Yet it is the spirit that is to be the one energy felt and recognised. "We henceforth," says the Apostle, "know no man after the flesh: even though we have known Christ after the flesh, yet now we know Him so no more."[1] And the spiritual, we have to remember, gives us the true self, the veritable other, the reality of the outward world of space. Here we meet no shadows, but the substance of all.

"When I pass from individuals to consider the Church as a whole, no less am I to see in the visible fellowship signs of the Master. Be it in great gatherings or in meetings of the few, I am to look for and be ready to accept Christ in their transactions. In all presentations that I meet of the

[1] 2 Cor. v. 16.

Church I am to recognise the Church as His body and that He Himself is its life.

"Disappointment after disappointment! as I look upon myself and on my brethren, and perhaps on the Church in general. Yet I am to hold to this 'Faith of the Son of God' as the inner energy of all."

True, most vitally true, "I am not to keep my eyes off Him." We are, as individuals and Churchmen, ever to look to the Head. The mottos "not I live, but He, not my life in the flesh, but His life in the flesh" imply and require (for the implication is too easily forgotten) a constant undivided gaze on Him.

We are to behold Him, first, in His glory where God is all in all. His true likeness is there, hidden awhile, until God made Him manifest. Then in the glimpses that come through the veil of the flesh we are to discern Him, as He has given Himself up for the Church, dispensed His very flesh and blood to be received by the faithful.

Yet we cannot in this present age be like Jesus as He really is

Yet—and here is a startling fact—with all this giving up of itself of the Perfect Life so intimately to men, and all this striving to live it, we are to discern that none of us here below, and no community of us, even the great Church itself on this earth, can in this present age hope to be in likeness of Jesus as He really is. On this the Scriptures are clear.

We ask ourselves the reason. We find it given by St. John and St. Paul.

St. John in his First Epistle plainly implies that, although, as he reports to us in his Gospel, when Jesus first came to earth and men beheld Him, they saw His glory as "of the only begotten from the Father, full of grace and truth,"[1] even with that face-to-face gaze and with the beholding of that glory men did not see Him as He really is: but the time shall come when He shall be manifested, returning with His kingdom,

[1] John i. 14.

and shall hand His kingdom over to God, even the Father, thus bringing to an end this present age of the world and ushering the new age in. Then at last shall we see Jesus as He is, and, at the sight of Him as He is, at last become like Him.

St. Paul has the same teaching. "Now," he says, "we see in a mirror darkly,[1] but then we shall see face to face. Now I know in part, but then shall I know even as also I have been known."[2]

But why is it, we may ask, that the Perfect Life thus cannot be seen as He really is until Jesus shall come with His Kingdom? We gather the reason from what St. Paul further tells us. When the Lord comes, the Apostle declares, He shall "hand over His Kingdom to God, even the Father, that God may be all in all."[3] So it is only when and where "God is all in all" that the Perfect Life can be properly seen as He is. We are very conscious that in this present age God is not all in all. The evil of the present world crossed the eyes of the disciples who saw Jesus in the flesh as it still crosses ours. With a vision so disturbed, men cannot see the Perfect Life as it really is. But the time shall come when the evil that crosses man's vision—the sins of the flesh, the vanities, the jealousies, the want of love, the fear of death—shall be banished at the coming of the Lord with His kingdom, all things gathered to Himself,[4] the last enemy, death, destroyed, that He may hand over that kingdom, which all along was the kingdom of God, to God even the Father. Then when at last God who is love shall be "all in all," shall we see the Perfect Life, the self-less Self, the Son of the Father's love as He is, and, having at last seen Him as He is, shall be granted by the Father our own marvellous spiritual "change,"[5] and so at last become like Him. Not till then.

[1] "Baffling reflections in a mirror" (James Moffatt).
[2] 1 Cor. xiii. 12.
[3] 1 Cor. xv. 24, 28.
[4] Eph. i. 23, "Him that filleth all in all," of which Westcott's translation is "him Who reaches His fulness in all things in all," and his comment: "Christ Himself finds His fulness in the sum of all that He brings into a living union with Himself."
[5] 1 Cor. 15, 52.

The Perfect Life the Sacraments are given to Convey

So the practical question which this book has had all the time before us is this: "Do we so celebrate and realise the Sacraments that we may pray and hope that to those who are faithful and pray shall therein be granted the assurance and power of the Perfect Life that came from God, lived that life upon earth, and has lifted it up to God's throne?

Is Holy Baptism for such, under God, or death unto sin, a birth of the Spirit? Is the Blessed Eucharist conveyant of the Body and Blood of the Sinless Life, now risen from the dead, taken in as the food of the kneeling communicant?

That, we have been led in our present discussion to see plainly, means for the Eucharist, the Sacrament we are here specially considering, that the Presence therein we shall conceive as no numinous presence, nor even as a spirit apart from our spirit, but as a spiritual presence, "Christ in us; we in Him," as Westcott put it; "the body and blood of the Lord in the heart of the faithful receiver," as Calvin expressed it. Surely it is not the bread and wine that the Lord endowed with His body and blood. We know how Westcott resented the thought. Thankful we are that the circumstances of the Institution make it clear. There his material body, the material embodiment of his spirit, is outside the material bread and wine. Plainly the Lord is giving these to be—as they are in themselves—food to be eaten. Evidently then these only "represent" (to use Westcott's word), "signify" (to use the expression in the Catechism), His blessed body and blood. But "represent" and "signify" they do. His very body and blood "His human nature," as Westcott explains, "as He lived and died under the conditions of earthly life," He is giving, giving to be taken in, so that the faithful believer shall live the Christ fully as a man, not only in spirit and in soul, but even in his very physical frame, his mortal body (as the Apostle puts it[1]) in verity "quickened by God, through the indwelling Spirit," receiving thereby

[1] Rom. viii. 11.

if not "the change"[1] (as Justin with a leap forward of faith puts it) at all events the preliminary stir in the flesh of "the mortal putting on immortality."[1]

Yet we have to wait for the Father to bring in the new age of the life everlasting before this change, which is the attainment of the likeness to the Perfect Life, can be granted, because, as we have learned, no man has yet seen Him as He is. His true home is where God is all in all, thence He came, and thither He ascended, and there He is now by His Father's right hand. There only, and only by those who are there, is He seen as He is. "Thither" we are "in heart and mind" indeed to "ascend," as our collect for Ascension Day sets us to pray; but here on earth in this present age our spiritual eye, crossed by its darkened outlook, is debarred from that glorious sight.

Accordingly, in the introductory portion of the Canon, our reformers inserted the words—an insertion which seems to be peculiarly their own, no outside literary authority having been discovered for it—"until His coming again," and in the form of the Administration of the bread and wine have retained the words "unto everlasting life" (which have been traced back to Alcuin and Charles the Great),[2] that is to say, until the Lord shall come, all enemies, even the last enemy, death, destroyed and the kingdom handed over by the Son to the Father, and thus God who is love becomes all in all, and we at last see the Perfect Life as He is, and through that sight of Him receive our great "change," and so at last become like Him, who is in the likeness of God, and stand before God in that final and true manhood of His which the Creator destined for us when He fashioned the world. To the liberty of that glory the whole Creation looks and in that liberty shall at last be released from its vanity.[3]

[1] 1 Cor. xv. 52.
[2] J. Bingham *Antiquities of the Christian Church*, Vol. V, pp. 382.
[3] Rom. viii. 20–22.

THEOLOGY LI
CLAREMONT, C

PRINTED BY
W. HEFFER AND SONS LTD.
CAMBRIDGE, ENGLAND.

THEOLOGY LIBRARY
CLAREMONT, CALIF.

A4088

BV
825.56
W4

Westcott's fear, by a disciple. Cambridge [Eng.] W. Heffer, 1930.
vi, 151p. 22cm.

"Corrigenda" slip inserted.

1. Lord's Supper--Reservation. 2. Lord's Supper--Anglican Communion. 2. Westcott, Brooke Foss, Bp. of Durham, 1825-1901. I. A disciple.

CCSC/mmb